

© 2000 Blackwell Science Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 247: 111–117

Class No.....

[illegible]

**EDUCATION FOR
INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING**

EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

BY

K. G. SAIYIDAIN, B.A., M. Ed.

*Educational Adviser to Bombay Government. Formerly
Professor of Education, Aligarh Muslim
University & Director of Education,
Jammu & Kashmir State*

HIND KITABS LIMITED

PUBLISHERS

BOMBAY

First published, April 1948

COPYRIGHT

Printed by A. S. Kamath at the Sharada Press,
Mangalore, and Published by V. Kulkarni,
Hind Kitabs Ltd., 261-263 Hornby Road, Bombay

To

PANDIT JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

(WHO HAS DONE MORE THAN ANY ONE ELSE
TO MAKE INDIA INTERNATIONALLY MINDED
AND WHO IS DESTINED, I BELIEVE, TO MAKE
AN ABIDING CONTRIBUTION TO THE CAUSE OF
INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND PEACE)

as a mark of affection and admiration

INTRODUCTION

It is after considerable hesitation that I have made up my mind to bring together in this small volume some Speeches and Addresses which I delivered outside India during 1946 on the subject of "Education for International Understanding". The hesitation is due to the feeling on my part that they make but a small contribution towards a subject which is as vast and complicated as it is urgent and vital for the survival of human civilization. The problems of the post-war world—in their national and international aspects as well as in their material, cultural and moral aspects—have become so complex and difficult that no simple or easy or short-cut solution can be found for them. They constitute a most powerful challenge to the intelligence as well as the goodwill of mankind and, unless we can "win the race against catastrophe" and secure peace, without which a rational and humane approach to world problems is impossible, we shall forfeit all the material, social and cultural riches that we have acquired after centuries of effort and struggle. Against the immensity of this task—which is nothing less than the reorientation of the human mind towards a new conception of the relationship of the individual to the community and of the States to the World Order and a weaning away of our loyalties and attachment from false gods—the ideas that I have tried to stress in these speeches may appear—as they do appear to me—to be rather inadequate. But I am convinced that, while they may be inadequate, they are not wrong or impracticable.

My approach to these problems is naturally from the educator's angle; I visualize them with reference to the operation of the motives and forces which regulate the conduct of men and women as individuals and in groups. But

I am not oblivious of the fact—and I have repeatedly stressed this point—that Education functions in the context of the wider socio-economic forces and systems and it can be effective and powerful only when the educational and the socio-economic factors are harmonized so that their effect is reinforced, instead of being neutralized as is the case at present. That is why in discussing “Education for Peace,” for instance, I have emphasized both the subjective and objective factors that are operative in provoking wars or ensuring peace. I am not, however, prepared to concede that the educational and psychological factors can either be ignored or belittled or that man is the helpless product of the operation of blind economic forces on which educational and cultural influences play only superficially. As an educator, I am profoundly convinced that our failures in the past in ensuring peace in the world have been largely due to the fact that we have not been able to utilize adequately the great resources of education, science, culture and the modern means of propaganda for this end and have relied far too much on the purely political or economic approach, usually inspired by fear or temporary expediency. That was, obviously, an attempt to build the structure of international fellowship and goodwill on quicksand. We should not be unduly surprised that they gave way at the first impact against organized power impulses and greed impulses. We should now try and provide, side by side with our social, economic and political organizations, a network of educational and cultural agencies, inspired by a new humanistic ideology, which would strengthen the tenuous reaching out of the human spirit towards a better and more co-operative and peaceful life. It was the object of these speeches to analyse the values which this spirit cherishes, and has always cherished, as basic to the decencies of human life. It was

matter of some gratification to me that these ideas were received not unfavourably by audiences in Australia and by the Conference in Paris and seemed, in many cases, to strike a responsive chord in their hearts. This consideration has overcome my hesitation and persuaded me to publish these Addresses in the hope that they might do something to stimulate discussion of this all-important subject in India and possibly outside.

We are just on the threshold of our newly won freedom when international contacts and relationships will become far more important for us than they have been in the past and we shall be able to play a more decisive and dynamic role in international affairs. If we are to do so worthily, it is necessary that we—our leaders as well as the public from whose ideas, attitudes and reactions the leaders ultimately derive their inspiration and their political ideology—should be equipped for it intellectually as well as morally. The equipment of mere passive goodwill and good intentions, which we possess in plenty, is not enough—not, at any rate, in the modern world. We must have the vision and the judgment to assess forces and tendencies correctly and choose our course of action intelligently and with due regard to the wider human interests. That is why I feel that the present time is appropriate for provoking a discussion of the issues that I have ventured to raise.

I might indicate the “history and geography” of these lectures and speeches. Part I contains lectures given at various sessions of the International Educational Conference, held in Australia under the auspices of the International Headquarters and the Australian Branch of the New Education Fellowship. The Fellowship is one of the most dynamic international agencies which has been working in the cause of a better and more creative

education ever since the First World War. It has helped to elucidate and popularize those basic ideals of the child's freedom and individuality and that recognition of his creative and spiritual potentialities which are now accepted by all progressive educationists as an integral part of their educational theory and practice. Latterly, it has been devoting increasing attention to the problem of Peace and International Understanding because of the poignant realization that its ideals have no chance of survival in a world over which hangs the constant threat of a total war. In the words of a recent bulletin of the Fellowship: "Will it help at all to take Shakespeare and the American Constitution to the 'backward peoples' if they are soon followed by bombs?" So it sponsored a Conference in Australia—which was generously welcomed by its Australian Section and the Australian educationists generally—on the all-important theme of how International Understanding and Peace could be promoted and consolidated through Education. An international team of fifteen speakers was invited from various countries of the world to speak at these Conferences, and I had the privilege of representing India on this team and speaking on a number of topics selected by the organizers of the Conference. An account of the Conference as well as my general impressions about Australia have also been included in the Appendices as a background to the lectures. It may be pointed out that all these Addresses—except the one dealing with the Educational Ideology of Islam—were given as talks and not read out as "papers". But they were written down later at the instance of the organizers so that they might have a permanent record of what the speakers had said. Readers will, therefore, find in them (and I hope overlook) a certain informality of style, a natural result of the fact that they are speeches made to audiences and I

have preferred to leave the form untouched. Moreover, there is a repetition of certain ideas, which would be out of place in a systematic thesis but may perhaps be overlooked in a collection of this kind, if only because they serve to stress and underline certain ideals and values which I regard as supremely important and which cannot—if I may say so—be emphasized too much in the present set-up of the world. I have also included a couple of the Radio Talks I gave from Australian Broadcasting Stations by way of a small tribute of appreciation and thanks to our hosts.

In order to help in the building up of mutual understanding and appreciation on an international scale, through the cultural and educational approach, the UNESCO has been set up as a subsidiary organization of the UNO and it is the business of all those who hold the cause of peace dear to strengthen it and to contribute to the success of its work. I had the privilege of being a member of the Indian delegation to its Preparatory Conference in London in 1945 and its first General Conference in Paris in 1946 and was thus closely associated with the drafting of its Constitution as well as the formulation of its programme of work. Amongst my distinguished colleagues on the two Indian delegations were Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, Dr Zakir Husain, Dr S. Radhakrishnan, Sir John Sargent, Dr J. H. Bhaba and Professor Amarnath Jha—a team of which any country would be proud—all of whom took a prominent part in the deliberations of the Conferences and the various Committees.

As a natural sequel to the general discussion of the problems of International Understanding, it appeared advisable to me to bring together in Part II the gist of a few brief contributions made by me to the deliberations of the UNESCO. It also includes a short "Introductory" article contributed to the Government of India Pamphlet *Unesco*

and an address given at several Australian conferences to show what the UNESCO could do to promote the cause of peace. In view of the fact that this Cultural Organization, which is an agency of far-reaching potential significance, has received inadequate publicity in India, it is hoped that these speeches may help to quicken interest in its objectives and activities.

It remains for me to thank the Australian Broadcasting Company for permission to reproduce the two speeches and the National Press Syndicate, Bombay, to include the article on "Impressions of an Australian Tour" written originally at their instance.

K. G. SAIYIDAIN

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	7

Part ONE

Australian Lectures

I. Education for Peace	17
II. "The Shape of Things to Come" in Culture	35
III. Internationalism in the Educational Ideology of Islam.	56
IV. Teaching of History for the Promotion of Internationalism and Peace	88
V. Education in India	97

Part TWO

The UNESCO

I. Introductory	123
II. The Role of the UNESCO in Promoting Inter- national Understanding and Peace	129
III. Assessing the Programme	148
IV. Putting Across the UNESCO Ideas	156
V. Appraising the Results	162

Appendices

I. Impressions of my Australian Tour	171
II. Impressions of the International Educational Conference	180
III. The World we Mean to Make	191
IV. Good-bye, Australia!	198
V. Postscript (<i>A Tribute to Mahatma Gandhi</i>).	205

■

PART ONE

AUSTRALIAN LECTURES

■

I. EDUCATION FOR PEACE

Education for Peace is easily the most important and pressing problem of the age. It is a problem in which India is specially interested for she has had a long, centuries' old tradition of peace, a tradition which persists in spite of the wars and conflicts which have disfigured the course of her history now and then. Three great religions have found their confluence in India: Buddhism, which is basically a religion of peace, service and charity; Hinduism, which believes in *ahimsa* and non-violence and is averse to taking life in any form; and Islam, e.g. which literally means peace and which has exalted peace and tolerance above all other values in life. While, like other peoples, we Indians have sometimes fallen from grace and sinned against the light in us—as is unfortunately happening today—our history is free from some of the worst manifestations of militarism and religious fanaticism and our political struggle has been waged largely on non-violent lines. I mention this fact, not in a spirit of vainglory—for, God knows, there are many things in my country which need overhauling and reform—but merely to indicate why I find it perfectly natural that people should feel genuinely anxious about peace and should look to education as one of the means for ensuring it.

In saying that peace is the most important and pressing problem of the age, I have used the superlative advisedly, for peace must, in my opinion, precede—as it is the prerequisite of—all those desirable things which are necessary for “the good life”—health, economic security, education and culture. There can neither be health, nor economic prosperity nor the leisured pursuit of art and literature and culture in a world that is either plunged in, or overshadowed, by war. For modern warfare is like a cancer in the body

politic which draws to itself the entire energy and attention of the people, leaving them unfit for anything else. In the total war which our scientific progress has made possible, they cannot think rightly, or feel rightly, or act rightly; their entire outlook, their "*weltanschauung*", becomes morbid and distorted and all their creative and constructive values are subordinated to the waging of war in the fond hope of winning peace! I use the word "fond" in its original sense of "foolish", for past experience has always shown that war, by itself, seldom results in a reasonable and worth-while peace. It brings hostilities to an end; it may at best establish an uneasy and unstable truce; it may break down the power of one of the parties completely, giving total domination to the other. But is there the slightest justification for believing that the animal passions, which are not only released but sedulously fostered during wars, will die out as soon as the last shot has been fired and war is officially ended? No, the bitter memories and the fierce hatreds generated by war continue to fester for generations and spoil international relations. The sense of the sanctity of life and the dignity and worth of the individual—which is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the cultured man—becomes dangerously dull and weak and that undermines the very foundations of civilized living. Look at the war that has just ended; it was waged in defence of democracy and the liberal values—at least so the protagonists of democracy claimed. Would it not be reasonable to hope that the end of this war will find the world in a sober, constructive, peaceful and co-operative mood, preoccupied with rebuilding the shattered fabric of society on the foundations of the threatened values in defence of which millions of lives have been lost and many more millions reduced to a state of misery from which death would be a welcome relief? But is that

the mood in which we find the world today? No, it is neither sober, nor constructive, nor peacefully inclined, nor co-operative. Mutual jealousies and distrust, insensitiveness to the higher values and preoccupation with the slick game of power politics continue to characterize the relationship of nations only recently engaged in a joint life-and-death struggle against what they regarded as forces of darkness. Why is that so? Why has not the defeat of Fascism and Nazism on the battle-field put an end to the ideas and the tendencies which they represent? Perhaps a remark made by Arthur Koestler in his recent book *The Yogi and the Commissar* may throw some light on this riddle:

“Fascism cannot be defeated on the battlefield alone; it has to be defeated inside peoples’ brains, hearts and glands; for it is merely a new word for a very old state of mind. Wherever there is talk of niggers, sheenies and chinks [and, may I add, of a Ghetto Bill against Indians?], wherever demand for better wages is called the Red menace and legal strike is smashed with leadpipes and shot-guns, fascism is there straight under your nose.” That is rather a telling phrase: “Fascism is merely a new word for a very old state of mind” and we would do well to ponder over its implications for war and peace.

Why is it that with a full and acute realization of its horrors and futility, men revert to war over and again? Common-sense tells them not to do so and the sharp experience of physical pain and of the mental and emotional agony which it entails underlines the teaching of common sense. All the great religions of the world—Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity and Islam which amongst them account for the large majority of the human race—have stressed the values of peace, have preached the sanctity of human life and have sought to discourage war. Yet in the

face of all these warnings and in spite of a vague and widespread but sincere desire for peace amongst the masses of all nations, war continues to be the curse of human history. Why is that so? What is that old "state of mind", parading under a variety of names, which triumphs over reason and common sense and moral considerations and brings about war with its unimaginable misery? Let every man, woman and child, every teacher, every politician, every "man of God" ask himself or herself this question every day till it is woven into the very texture of their thought.

If we could analyse briefly the different types of causes which bring about wars, we might be in a position to suggest how to arrest them. In the early period of history we find that a war is either just a display of brute strength or an attempt to secure the necessities of life in an age which is characterized by scarcity. Some wars are described by the curious name of "Religious Wars" in which the motivating cause is religious differences. Sometimes groups or nations may be so cramped for space as may need certain natural and material resources so desperately that they are prepared to go to war to secure them. More recently, wars have been caused predominantly, if not exclusively, by economic reasons; even when they have been represented as ideological conflicts, there have been deep underlying economic rivalries. Is it possible to visualize these different causes as part of some fundamental psychological problem? I think so. Groups that indulge in a pugnacious display of brute strength do so because they have not the good sense, intellectual or moral, to realize poignantly what their blatant self-expression means for their weaker adversaries. Religious wars reveal a mentality which seeks to deny to others the freedom of thought and worship which we enjoy ourselves. The political and

economic wars are obviously due to the fact that some nations are anxious to exploit others, to appropriate all that they can to themselves without regard to the needs and rights of others—markets for trade, cheap labour, natural resources—and to deprive them of the opportunities for full and unfettered growth. The fundamental causes, therefore, are pugnacity, intolerance and exploitation, all arising out of an insensitiveness to the needs and the welfare of other groups. They are, therefore, due as much to moral and psychological causes as to material factors and circumstances, and the problem of eradicating them bears a double aspect, namely, how can we eradicate the psychological causes which create a war-like mentality and how can we alter the material circumstances which form a favourable soil for its growth and display? Both are equally important and though the educationist is naturally more concerned with the former nothing will be gained by belittling the latter. I propose to deal briefly with both.

Let us first note some of the significant characteristics of the modern international scene which determine the nature of our problem. The world today differs markedly from what it was like even fifty years ago. Modern science and the means of rapid communication have conquered both space and time; distance has shrunk to negligible proportions and it is altogether a much smaller world in which the interests and welfare of all the peoples have become interdependent. A war, a famine, an epidemic or the menace of an atom bomb are highlights revealing this interdependence in a striking manner. But it is just as true in the every-day humdrum life of the people. Peace and war have both become one and indivisible—they are literally “global” and we are in actual fact living in what Wendell Willkie has called “One World”. A war starts in Europe and three

million people die of famine in Bengal and millions more find themselves uprooted from their homeland, cut off from their normal occupations and deprived of all that makes life pleasant, gracious and meaningful. These things must be woven into the texture of our thought and action; we must either think and act internationally or perish, and we can neither so think nor act till we are trained to feel internationally, for it is emotion which provides the dynamic for all purposive activity. To this fact, which is within the educationist's province, I shall revert later.

Again, this is an age of democracy—not indeed in the sense that it has achieved democracy but that it is striving, with many reverses and set-backs, towards a democratic social order. The recent defeat of Fascism after an interlude of unholy triumph, lends support to this view. No doubt this democracy is imperfect—in many countries it has given the vote to all without that social equality and economic justice which alone can put meaning into the vote. But it is certainly an instrument with the help of which we may hope to forge a better future and redress some of the inequalities and injustices which disfigure our present social economy. And in spite of all these imperfections, democracy does imply that, in the ultimate analysis, the will of the people should prevail at least in times of great crisis, as happened, for instance, when British public opinion turned out Chamberlain's effete Government. Now this is an important point: it means that even for waging a war it is necessary in a democracy to court the people's approval—maybe by seducing their reason and playing upon their passions, but it has to be done. Therein shines a ray of hope. For it is usually the common man who craves for peace, and the demagogue, the profiteer or the expansionist who wants war and tries to win over the masses to his view in

order to work out his nefarious purposes. If the masses were educated intelligently so that they could discriminate between what is good and what is harmful for them, if we could stiffen their resistance to the glib salesmanship of the merchants of death, there would be some possibility of defeating them and arresting the chances of war. This again is ultimately an educational problem.

There is yet another characteristic of this age with which we have to reckon—its glaring economic anomalies, its unashamed exploitation of weaker groups and the material and cultural deprivations from which a majority of the people suffer. No doubt exploitation has always beset the collective life of man but the scientific organization of industry and the growth of capitalism and imperialism during the last one hundred and fifty years have greatly accentuated this tendency and the contrasts today are more galling than ever. In the past, people were often apt to regard their poor and miserable lot as the decree of an inexorable and unfeeling Fate about which they could do nothing! They lived in an age of scarcity in which there were not enough material and cultural goods to go round and inevitably there was scramble for them and whole nations and classes of people suffered in consequence. But, thanks to the advances in science and productive technique, it has become possible for the first time in human history to ensure reasonable comfort, material security and cultural amenities for all the peoples of the earth, provided we have the goodwill and the common sense to organize our work and economy on rational and co-operative lines. It has been estimated that four hours' work a day in a five-day week could provide all the necessary goods and services needed for mankind, provided it was properly organized and all joined in it and inefficiency and waste were eliminated. So while

in the past there may have been some justification for that blind irrational struggle for existence which often resulted in wars and class conflicts and material and cultural deprivation, there is no such justification for these things in this age of plenty when production has been multiplied a hundredfold—except, of course, the justification we may find in human greed and stupidity! But they exist more aggressively than ever and form a favourable soil in which the seeds of war can be sown and cultivated. So long as there is want and poverty and ignorance and inequality of opportunity for whole nations and classes and groups, so long as the material and cultural wealth which is the common heritage of mankind is denied to large sections, so long as our conscience suffers a majority of people to be condemned to lead poor, barren and incomplete lives, there is dangerous dynamite strewn along the pathway of the earth which may, and does from time to time destroy all that decades of patient constructive effort had built. It is therefore wrong and silly to assert that war is rooted either in the nature of things or in human nature, that it cannot be outlawed and that it is Utopian to dream of peace as the normal state of the world. War is rooted really in the conditions that have been created by men and above all in the social injustices which often make it inevitable. But it is so deadly, so wasteful and such a negation of all that the best minds of the race have preached and practised that it must, and can, be avoided if mankind is to be spared its otherwise richly deserved doom.

I have purposely devoted considerable space to discussing the psychology and the causes of war, because they provide the persisting background of the educator's work. A study of this background effectively disposes of that indolent and self-complacent approach which acts on

the assumption that anything like peace sermons or the academic study of other peoples and their ways will solve this difficult problem. It has also stressed the fact that causes of war are both material and psychological, objective as well as subjective, and unless we attack it on both fronts we shall be merely deluding ourselves. Have you ever noticed how sometimes a hard crust is formed over a boil? Till that crust is removed, surgically or otherwise, no medicine can be effective. The same thing applies to the body politic; unless we remove the fundamental economic and social injustices, the exploitation and the exclusiveness which are eating like a canker into it, the educational approach will not make much headway. No doubt, the two are in many ways interrelated and interdependent and we cannot hope to awaken the social conscience to the enormities of the present socio-economic order without trying to change the ideas and emotions of the people through education. But it is necessary to stress the objective factors because there is always the danger that the teachers, wrapt up in the fallacy of the cave, may fail to see the wider context and ramifications of their activity and imagine themselves safe and secure while sitting on top of a smouldering social volcano. They must take their full share as citizens, in the crusade for social justice, and as teachers they must make its demands and implications to stand out clearly in the heart and mind of their students.

Let us now turn to our specific problem. How much can education help directly in creating a mentality for peace and strengthen the forces which make for a more just, more rational, more peaceful and more co-operative social order? Personally, I have great faith in education as a determining force which can bring about purposeful changes in the mentality of nations. The history of the last two centuries

offers several illustrative examples: the U.S.A., a conglomeration of many diverse races and nationalities, transforming itself into a fairly homogeneous people with a faith in democracy—which may be rather crude and naive in some ways but is undoubtedly a great achievement—gained through the quiet, unobtrusive and long-range influence of education; Turkey, a rather slow and mediæval State, quickening into modernism under Mustafa Kamal partly through the impact of a reorganized educational system; Russia and Germany, more spectacular examples of what effectively organized education, dominated by a clear-cut and comprehensive ideology, can do to transform the entire psychology of a whole nation. So, for good or evil, education is a powerful force and there is no reason why we should not use it resolutely in the service of peace.

We should remember, however, that when we speak of "Education" in this connexion, we are not thinking merely of what goes on in schools and colleges but of the wider network of formative influences which affect the ideas, feelings and opinions of the people—the press, the platform, books, radio, theatre, cinema, religious services and all the other means for the diffusion of ideas and appeal to the emotions. It is bad enough when education and the social order are out of joint; it would be worse and a greater pity if all these different educative agencies failed to pull together. When they are all so oriented as to train people in the ways of peace, even as in the past they have often been prostituted to war-like purposes, education can have a telling and decisive influence. This implies that we must not look upon them as irresponsible institutions or merely as means of amusement; we must somehow co-ordinate them all into an educational pattern open to educational guidance. It does not, of course, mean any improper restrictions on the liberty

of the press or the platform or the theatre, for their liberty is the very life-breath of democracy. But it does mean that if any of these cultural services is misused for anti-social purposes like propaganda in favour of war or of racial and religious hatred, it is the inalienable moral right of society to cry halt, even as it has the authority to enforce obedience to the rules and regulations of hygiene and sanitation at the time of epidemics. Coming to the school proper; there are numerous opportunities for the teacher, almost at every step, to tip the scales in favour of peace. Let me give a few examples. I have already mentioned that one of the ways in which the war-mongers defeat the peace-loving people is by playing upon their fears and prejudices and giving them a deliberately distorted view of the situation. They exploit the press and the platform, even the cinema and the theatre, for the purpose. What facilitates their work is the easy credulity of the masses, their fear of independent thinking and their lack of critical capacity. Their education has not taught them to weigh evidence, to assess pros and cons or to discount loud and tendentious talk; it has taught them instead to swallow as gospel truth the spoken and the printed word, provided it comes from what they vaguely regard as their party. They are helpless before propaganda and any crisis, real or manufactured, can reduce them to a state of mass hysteria which means a temporary inhibition of reason and intellect. It is, therefore, a first condition for the functioning of an educated and peaceful democracy that people should be trained to think for themselves and that they should regard loyalty to Truth as more important than any other loyalty in life, whether to one's nation or race or country or community or anything else. The teacher of social studies has a specially significant role to play in this behalf. So far the teaching of history, for instance, has

been dominated by wrong and limited notions. It has been largely confined to the students' own country and people and they have not been presented the wider context of world history or taught the fascinating "Story of Man" in whose setting alone can national history be properly understood and appreciated. Again, the inculcation of patriotism has been, consciously or unconsciously, the dominant aim and it has been misconstrued to mean an exaltation of one's country above all others, an exaggeration of its achievements and a whitewashing of all that may be discreditable in its annals. On the other hand, there is also a tendency to belittle the contributions of other peoples, particularly those with whom the country has been closely associated. This is the attitude of "my country—right or wrong" which is a menace to peace and which brought forth Edith Cavell's historic protest: "Patriotism is not enough." Patriotism is not enough if it stands in the way of the wider loyalty to humanity, if, in other words, it is not intelligent but conveniently and self-complacently blind! True patriotism is as impatient and critical of the evils and injustices and misdeeds of one's country as it is proud and appreciative of its achievements in the domain of arts and letters and culture, of government and administration and social services. A good teacher of history should inculcate in his students pride and admiration for all that is good and great in the annals of man—whether in China or Persia or Germany or Denmark or Peru—and righteous indignation at "all that man has made of man" in his greed and arrogance and selfishness. The well-known Dutch journalist Von Passen in his great book *Days of Our Years* describes with unsparing vividness what the most civilized nations of Europe have done not only to the Asiatics and Africans in their colonies but also to the socially depressed classes of their own countrymen. When British or

Dutch or Spanish or Portuguese children read of the glories of their Empire, they should also have the opportunity to see the other side of the medal—that the glittering facade of their civilization had been built on foundations of almost incredible degradation and exploitation. And there are plenty of such dark corners in all the national corridors of history—the Japanese treatment of the Chinese, the German treatment of the Jews, the American treatment of the Negroes, the Indian treatment of the “depressed classes” as “untouchables!” No study of history in the higher classes will be either complete or satisfactory which leaves these glaring injustices out of the picture. The American student of history should not only know the gracious and powerful America of the conventional text-books and the Propaganda Department but also America as depicted by Sinclair Lewis, Upton Sinclair, Dreiser and Steinbeck. The British and Indian students of history should not be limited to a study of Macaulay and Thompson but should also get a glimpse into the “Poverty-stricken India” of William Digby and the “Subject India” of Brailsford. A poignant realization of where we have gone wrong, a gracious appreciation of what others have contributed to culture and progress, a passionate attachment to Truth even though it may be against us and a refusal to compromise or parley with aggressive nationalism or chauvinism—these should be the fine fruits of the study of history. If these are not consciously and persistently striven for, history will fail to nurture that fair-mindedness and objectivity which is a necessary ingredient in a broad international outlook. I recall to myself in this connexion a verse from the Quran, the Holy Book of the Muslims, which says:

“And there should be amongst you a group of persons charged specially with the task of inviting people to-

what is good, instructing them to do what is right and refrain from doing what is wrong.....who will be just even against themselves."

Such groups of persons wedded to truth and justice and the ideal of service are needed in every country—they are the salt of the earth and they alone can form a bulwark against the forces of darkness and evil.

Again, education can strengthen in us the sense of the interdependence and solidarity of mankind—not merely as an academic thesis advocated by philosophers or a noble ideal preached by prophets but as an inescapable fact of our every-day life which we must either accept or perish. Thousands of years ago was posed the question: "Am I my brother's keeper?" and whatever answer may have been given then, the only right answer today is an emphatic affirmative. Whatever disturbs the peace or upsets the general economy of life in, say, China or Brazil is bound to have repercussions, mild or strong, all over the world. Our school teaching should definitely set about impressing upon the young mind, through concrete examples, the nature and meaning of this interdependence. It should also, as Bertrand Russell has somewhere suggested, develop their imagination so that they might translate cold printed statistics pertaining to distant countries into warm living concrete pictures. The apathy and indifference about other peoples' woes, which we find in all countries, is due as much to ignorance or lack of imagination as to emotional insensitiveness. You often find a terrible flood or epidemic in China or a widespread famine in India, causing several million deaths, being reported in British or American papers as a mere news item packed away in some out-of-the-way corner while the pride of place may be given to such exciting things as cricket or races or the latest sensational murder or matrimonial scandal

that appeals to the low taste of its half-educated readers. It is not possible for them to translate into moving and tragic pictures what this flood or famine or epidemic means to millions of living and feeling human beings like themselves—misery, death and destruction, the uprooting of life from its ancient foundations, the frustration of hope, the irresistible onslaught of black despair or the permanent impairment of the moral and physical fibre. This shows that their education has been defective and is unequal to the challenge of the age. It is the special function of science and geography teaching to demonstrate and to elucidate this fact of interdependence and to show that reasonable standards of life cannot be established or maintained in the world unless there is a rational pooling of resources and that problems like those of health, nutrition and agriculture can only be tackled on an international level. Today the famine that stalks over three continents has made people conscious of the international nature of the food situation. But it is only an intellectual awareness and not a dynamic emotional realization; and one is afraid that when the crisis is over people may relapse into their old indifference and self-centredness. My contention is that in the mid-twentieth century these problems are perennial problems, not the chance offspring of any temporary emergency. The world will not be a sane and peaceful place till the productive resources of all countries are properly organized, agriculture is modernized and the spectre of famine is banished for ever. And, in any case, what will it avail, say, Canada or Australia if their granaries are full while India or China or Poland starve and disease and distress, which are no respecters of frontiers, stalk the world unchecked?

But a mere knowledge of interdependence, such as science can give and imagination can vivify, is not enough:

what is needed is a strengthening of the feeling of personal responsibility for all that is evil and ugly and cramping in the world, whether or not we are specifically involved. I was once discussing with an English educationist the need for greater knowledge and understanding of other peoples on the part of the British who as a rule are far too ill-informed about the ways and manners of other nations. She admitted the fact but came out with the unexpected question: "Do you think British children will feel more kindly disposed towards, or more appreciative of say, India or China or Africa, if they knew of their high percentages of illiteracy and mortality or their low standards of sanitation and hygiene and health? Is there not a danger that they may come to regard themselves as superior because their standards of literacy and hygiene are higher and their plumbing more efficient?" The danger is certainly there if they look upon these unpleasant facts objectively, in a spirit of superior detachment—as if examining a biological specimen under the microscope! But it is also possible to look at the situation differently, with a sense of corporate responsibility, of belonging together, of being the citizens of a world which is one and indivisible. They should feel that what happens in other lands is their concern also, that they too share the responsibility for it—as western nations certainly do in the case of India, Egypt, Africa and China—and that they have really no moral right to enjoy health or culture or material prosperity so long as there are countries which lack even the barest rudiments of "the good life". It is not a question of that hypocritical "white man's burden"—which is often borne on the shoulders of the blacks or the browns—but a feeling on the part of all the nations of the world that they must carry their common burden jointly. I am always struck by the fine idealism and

sturdy common sense of the little boy who was panting up the hill with his younger brother on his back. A passer-by asked him sympathetically: "Hello, young man, don't you find the burden rather heavy?" The boy stopped dead in his tracks and replied, "That, sir, is not a burden; it is my brother!" It is in this spirit that we must study the culture and life of other peoples. We should not be merely intellectually cognizant of what they are like—through our study of history, geography and science—but our knowledge should be suffused with the glow of emotion, of a poignant, personal realization. This can only be achieved by the proper direction and orientation of the entire social, moral and ethical training provided by the school through its curricular and extra-curricular activities. The young should not only be made to know and feel but opportunities should be provided for them also to do something practical in the service of international amity and concord; and in a world where suffering and misery abound and the problem of the refugees has made millions of people live "on the margin of chaos" such opportunities are not hard to find.

I have already pointed out that there is in the world a wide-spread if rather vague feeling in favour of peace. As a matter of fact, I think the common man who provides cannon fodder has never been enamoured of war; he has almost always been the dupe of clever and unscrupulous demagogues who carried on wars from a safe distance. The technique of modern warfare has, however, abolished the distance between the civilians and the fighting forces and we are all in the front line now. Let us hope that this will discount the readiness of the arm-chair politicians to send others to the battle-field. The atom bomb outrage horrified and sobered down even the war-hardened veterans. So we may look forward to an increasing horror and

distaste for war. What we need now is a concerted attempt at canalizing it into a dynamic force. In this task education must play a worthy part and the foundation of a courageous and aggressive peace mentality must be laid in the schools. In the past, men and women working in the field of education and culture have been far too apt to submit to dictation by the wielders of power morally and intellectually inferior to them. The war-mongers said "Let there be war" and writers, artists, scientists and men of culture fell tamely in line—as if they had no opinion to express, no opposition to offer, no cause of their own to fight for! This is a most unsatisfactory position and it is high time that teachers and men of ideas, who understand these things better and see them in a truer perspective, had a dominant voice in the determination of national policies and in shaping the destiny of man. I am reminded of the reply given by an Oxford Professor during the 1914-18 War to a high army officer who asked him somewhat condescendingly, "And tell me, Professor, what have *you* been doing during this war?" The Professor replied quietly, "Oh! nothing much. I am merely concerned with the creation of the culture that you are fighting to preserve!" It is necessary for us to cultivate something of the conscious dignity of this reply and to remember that even the most just war is at best a means for preserving and guarding the values of Peace—values which have to do with art and literature and morality and social justice and all the creative and constructive activities which form the warp and woof of civilized life.

II. "THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME"— IN CULTURE

I have chosen as the theme of my address a topic which savours of the prophetic, and indulging in prophecies is rather a dangerous pastime. With all the spectacular progress that man has made in the various domains of knowledge, he still remains ignorant of the future, and while he may make predictions with some certainty in the realm of the physical sciences, and with less certainty in the biological sciences, he is still an ill-informed fumbler in the domain of the social sciences. He is unable to assess properly the impact of the varied and manifold forces that play upon his individual and collective life or to foresee in what direction the resultant of these social and psychological forces must be sought. In the words of a great Indian poet: "He who has traced the stars in their courses has not learned to travel sensibly in the world of his own mind. He has got so entangled in the labyrinth of his Intellect that he cannot decide between Good and Evil." We cannot, therefore, prophesy with any assurance what "the shape of things" is going to be in the distant or even in the near future. An H. G. Wells might, with some confidence talk of "the shape of things to come" in the material or the scientific domain. It is a far more difficult and elusive matter, however, to see even "through a glass, darkly" how the social, economic and cultural life of a people is going to shape. There is certainly a process of historical evolution but it is not easy to trace its outline even under normal conditions, and when conditions are abnormal it becomes impossible to do so. Thus, for instance, towards the end of the nineteenth century, when a kind of milk-and-water parliamentary democracy seemed firmly established and the

capitalistic order appeared to be fairly stabilized, who could have prophesied with any certainty the development of Socialism and Communism or the rise of Hitler and the emergence of the Nazi menace to the culture and peace of mankind? It sometimes happens that an unexpected development or the rise of some powerful individual throws the historical process out of gear. Consequently, it is impossible to forecast precisely what the shape of culture is going to be in the future. All that one can attempt is to outline the broad features of this culture so far as one can visualize it at present, and even then it is not unlikely that the picture will largely be the outcome of wishful thinking—it will depict objectively not what is going to happen so much as what one would like to happen or what in one's opinion should happen. It is a pardonable weakness of human nature to project its prejudices and prepossessions into the world of ideas, and many of the classic Utopias which are part of the precious heritage of world literature are an expression of this tendency. I cannot possibly claim exemption from this weakness but can only promise that I shall try not to let my emotions run away with my reason.

You might however ask why I should choose such a theme for my talk to a gathering like this when I realize myself that it is, at best, in the nature of an uncertain speculation. I have often the feeling that we who are engaged in our particular spheres of academic work are apt to become too engrossed in our specialized studies and tend to overlook the larger problems of human life out of which they have taken their origin. We are often subject to the fallacy of the man in the jungle who cannot see the wood for the trees. It is necessary, therefore, that all of us who are preoccupied with our special departments and sub-departments of culture should occasionally take a broader

view and survey the wider universe in which our own little intellectual island is situated. Every activity, physical or mental, gains its significance from its ramifications and interconnexions with other activities, and a vision of the whole panorama is essential for achieving the right perspective. We may be engaged in different cultural and practical activities with their special interests. But there is one great, all embracing, universally significant set of questions which overshadows our several and separate activities and in which it is our business as human beings to take an intelligent interest, namely, what is the nature of the social order in which we and millions of our fellow human beings are living? What is the type of culture that this social order has created? How far does this culture and this social order conform to our ideas of social justice and favour the development of men and women to their full stature? And as a necessary and imperative corollary of these questions: What can we do to improve or change or reconstruct or revolutionize this cultural and social order, so that the "Shape of Things to Come" may be nearer to the heart's desire? There are undoubtedly many persons—and there have always been such persons—who have cold-shouldered or to use a popular modern phrase, "by-passed" such questions, either because they were too engrossed in money-making or too preoccupied with their finicky literary and artistic activities or too ignorant and insensitive to bother about how other people were living and working and whether they had any cultural facilities at all. With a mean and pernicious singleness of purpose, they devote themselves entirely to their own individual interests, and the larger social problem leaves them unconcerned. I put it to you, however, that no man or woman with a sensitive social conscience, whatever his or her special preoccupation may

be, can in this age afford to remain indifferent to this crucial problem of man's cultural destiny. And, mind you, it is not merely the question of a sensitive conscience but also of enlightened self-interest. It might have been possible, even a hundred years ago, for members of the privileged classes to retire into their ivory towers and lead a pleasant, secluded life sheltered from the rough-and-tumble of everyday existence. But in this age, scientific progress and industrial development have generated such powerful, dynamic forces that no man can, or dare, live unto himself alone and the ivory towers are no longer safe from the intrusion of weary and exasperated masses who have been locked out of them for centuries. The complacent indifference of the denizens of these towers is likely to recoil on themselves like a boomerang, and unless they wake up betimes and take notice, there is every danger not only of the precious fruits of their culture turning bitter in their mouths, but also of their being forcibly evicted from their cherished domain. I cannot easily forget the haunting remark of a modern writer: "The grace and culture of our life has been distilled out of the darkness of the masses." I call it a haunting remark, because it is difficult to defend those who have appropriated the benefits of culture for themselves or their small class or coterie and have turned a blind eye to the depressing social and cultural *milieu* in which millions and millions of their fellow beings are condemned to serve their life-sentence! I am venturing to invite the attention of this distinguished and cultivated audience to this important issue in the hope that some of them, at least, may be persuaded to contribute their share to that radical social and cultural reconstruction without which this sorry world of ours is destined to remain on the verge of disaster, liable to explode at any moment.

Let me try at this stage to elucidate the meaning of the term "Culture" which so far I have taken for granted. We generally use this term in two different contexts—the personal culture of the individual and the culture of a people or a group or a community. When we speak of a person as cultured, we generally mean that he has cultivated in himself certain qualities like interest in literature, appreciation of art, good manners, social tact and the art of conversation. Similarly, when we speak of the culture of a people, we are thinking of their achievement in the domain of arts and crafts, music and architecture, literature and the sciences and the modes of social life, i.e. the racial heritage in which every generation brings up, or tries to bring up, its younger members. Education is only the significant process of the transmission of this cultural heritage to the young.

Now, is there any intrinsic relationship between these two uses of the word? Does the personal culture of the members of a community determine the nature and type of its national culture? I think it will be generally conceded that there is a genuine and all-pervasive connexion between the two. It is not, however, the superficial relationship which can be accounted for by the simple process of arithmetical addition, i.e. if all the members of a community are polite and well-behaved or interested in art and literature, the community as a whole will have cultivated tastes and manners. That is an obvious truism which need not be laboured. The relationship I am propounding is more subtle and lies deeper because it determines the fundamental nature of a people's creative activity and their cultural outlook. Let me illustrate this point by a few examples.

Some time ago I made a study of the problem of what constitutes the essence of personal culture and incorporated

the results of the study in one or two publications. After examining critically the views of two great contemporary thinkers of the West, Russell and Dewey, and two of the East, Iqbal and Tagore, I tried to crystallize the basic essentials of personal culture into the following six qualities:

Vitality,
 Courage,
 Sensitiveness or Sympathy,
 Intelligence,
 Reverence

and (what an Indian philosopher, Iqbal, has called) *faqr*. This is not the place to discuss the *raison d'être* of this selection, and while we may differ as to their relative importance, perhaps no one will seriously question their place in culture. My thesis is that the cultivation of these qualities in individuals will largely determine the quality of national culture and it is only through their exercise that a dynamic, living and abiding culture can come into being. Thus it is obvious that a culture which assigns a low value to intelligence will be unprogressive and obscurantist; it will worship tradition and be averse to change; it will fail to adapt itself to the dynamic of a changing social situation. Likewise, if individuals lack courage, which is the motive power for action, even intelligence cannot be their salvation. They will do nothing to reconstruct or improve their cultural heritage. A study of human history, clearly shows that courage is essential for every worth-while endeavour. Man's life is beset with all kinds of temptations which tend to lure him away from the hard and uphill path of duty and rectitude; there are various entanglements, intellectual and emotional, from which one has to break away in order to achieve freedom and integrity of mind. For this purpose courage of a very high order—physical,

intellectual and moral—is needed at every step and it is obvious that a fear-dominated culture and civilization will differ fundamentally from a culture or civilization in which courage as a normal attitude to life confers freedom and happiness.

Or take yet another of these qualities which in the realm of art may be described as sensitiveness and in the realm of social life and conduct as sympathy. It is at once the artistic as well as the moral foundation of a humanized culture. What is it that makes a poem or a picture or a musical composition a thing of wide or universal appeal and sets the chords of the human heart a-quiver? When the heart of the poet, the artist or the musician is in tune with the joys and sorrows of mankind, when, like the strings of a musical instrument, it can respond to the heart-throbs of his fellow-men—it is then that he can create a thing of abiding beauty and significance. It is possible for an artist skilled in the technique of his art to create a thing of formal beauty through the magic of words or the miracle of form or the harmony of sound and it may appeal to a small coterie of high-brow critics, but can such art endure or can it enrich a living culture? No; what gives the poetry of a Shakespeare or a Ghalib its charm and its pathos, what invests the smile of a Mona Lisa with a haunting mystery, what makes the music of a Beethoven an ecstasy of delight to the listener is their essential and undeniable humanity, their sensitiveness to the forces and impulses of their environment, their sure-fingered probing of the deepest sources of human feelings and emotions. When the artist loses this quality of intimate imaginative sympathy and quick emotional responsiveness, he becomes a mere conjurer who may dazzle us by his legerdemain and not an artist who can exalt or soothe or thrill us by his creations.

Closely allied to sensitiveness is another feeling—attitude—the attitude of reverence to all creation, the consciousness that not only God's wonderful handiwork but also man and his handiwork are value-bearing entities and possess incalculable significance. We must therefore approach them not in a spirit of intolerance and exploitation but in a spirit of reverence which includes love and respect and is the basis of the religious feeling. It is only the exceptional poet or artist or the truly religious person possessing this precious quality of reverence who can see the glory of God in the meanest of his creatures or read sermons in stones and books in running brooks. The religious or political leader who looks upon his fellow-men as so much raw material to be exploited for his personal aggrandisement or for satisfying his power-lust is utterly bereft of this sense of reverence. When we have the imagination, the sympathy and the reverence to treat every human being as an end in himself and not merely as a means to the ends of others, we may be able to practise the art of social service and become the architects of a better social order and a more humane culture based on justice and tolerance.

Lastly, let me say a few words about this elusive quality of *faqr* which is not unknown to the East but is perhaps a stranger to the modern West. It is an Arabic word and it means a state of want or the material condition of a *faqr* or mendicant, without, however, a mendicant's hankering after wealth or material goods. But its ethical and philosophical implications go much deeper. It does not mean an attitude of withdrawal and renunciation in the ordinary meaning of the words, but rather the capacity to retain one's mental and emotional integrity and independence after one has asserted oneself successfully against the world of material phenomena so that one may use the power so

gained for valuable impersonal ends and not for personal glory or power or aggrandisement. It requires courage certainly, but it requires more than courage; it postulates a balanced judgment and a proper sense of values. But even these are not enough; it means, above all, a genuine belief that one's true self, one's soul, is far more precious than all the pearls and rubies and the other counters for which men have often bartered away their independence, their integrity and their freedom. Now this *faqr* is an essential ingredient in the culture of the finest spirits that have walked this earth—you cannot conceive of a Buddha or a Christ or a Mohammad or a Husain being deflected from his noble purpose or purchased at any conceivable price. You will also find this quality reflected in the lives of some of the great creative artists; they carried on their work not in the lap of luxury in the courts of Emperors but often in conditions of dire poverty and adversity and many of them were too self-respecting to be bought over for any consideration. And it is people inspired by this spirit who have succeeded in moulding and shaping the social order, because they had the courage of their convictions and were prepared even to die for their cause. They did not want anything for themselves and, therefore, had the courage to break away from the fetters of the existing systems and institutions and hew out new ones, where human individuality and culture would have a freer scope for self-expression and development. The history of the world shows that all great political and social changes have been brought about by small groups of selfless and courageous persons who devoted themselves wholeheartedly, in the spirit of *faqr*, to the attainment of their cherished goal and this contributed to the development of new cultural forms. There, again, you can easily visualize the startling difference between a culture based on greed and one inspired by *faqr*.

As a background to the discussion of the culture of the future, let us try and visualize some of the unlovely features that characterize our contemporary as well as earlier cultures. If we critically examine past cultures, we will find that most of them were based on certain principles and assumptions about life which we cannot now accept as valid. They postulated a dualism between culture and economics on the one hand and culture and ethics on the other. Consciously or unconsciously, they were inspired by the idea that the activities which create or develop culture are entirely distinct and separate from those that sustain economic and vocational life. They believed that poetry, art, music, literature—the theoretical sciences were included later—all belonged to a higher and more ethereal domain which was the realm of the spirit and the pure intellect, and this domain was not to be polluted by the intrusion of mundane affairs and the activities of everyday life. In the glorious and much applauded civilization of the Greeks, for instance, one sees this antithesis sharply defined, because their civilization postulated a working class—which had more or less the status of slaves—and a class of cultured people—poets, musicians, philosophers—who concerned themselves exclusively with the things of the mind and did not soil their hands with productive work or manual labour. In ancient India, or for that matter in the modern West till recently, culture was regarded as a thing-in-itself, quite unconnected with and aloof from the farm and the marketplace; the very principle on which the division of castes and social functions was based shows that society did not regard culture as the natural right and heritage of every human being.

In these civilizations, there was no clear recognition of the fact that all culture originally grew out of the activities

of common life. The rude manual labour and productive activities of the primitive man developed into the various crafts so that what started as a strictly limited utilitarian response to a felt need—like house-building or making of utensils or producing of various sounds to indicate different ideas—gradually developed into arts and crafts combining the element of beauty with that of utility. Now, so long as this intimacy of relationship between productive work and art is maintained, art is seen as an expression of a nation's cultural and spiritual preoccupations; it is vital, organic and significant. As the great heart of a people throbs in unison and its creative capacities flow into many and varied channels, the highest expressions of the spirit of its art and culture come into being. But when this vital link is broken, when art is taken up by a small coterie of people as their special preserve, and the life of the large masses of people is circumscribed within the dreary routine of a wage slavery, then art and culture become academic, superficial and anaemic. They are rather like the veneer that hides the poor and ugly quality of wood beneath an apparently attractive exterior. While the masses of people remain steeped in ignorance, poverty, disease and apathy, the special votaries of art and culture cultivate an artificial, uninspiring and unwholesome type of refinement which neither enriches the life of the people nor vitalizes their own.

Thus we find that the function of culture has been generally misunderstood or sometimes perverted. Instead of being considered as an essential flowering of life for the enjoyment of all, it has come to be regarded rather like the jealously guarded flower-garden of an exclusive aristocrat who does not want the common rabble to come swarming into it! That is, it became essentially a class culture based on disguised or undisguised slavery, in which one small

privileged group says, in effect, to the rest of the community : "You will toil and labour and produce the goods that are necessary for sustaining life, while we shall toy with the playthings of culture and be the ornament of this otherwise dull and drab and ugly society." The upper classes have always tried by various means to keep the people ignorant and insensitive to their lot or humbug them for a time with false promises or deceptive reforms and concessions. But this is naturally unfair and cannot go on indefinitely. Such a culture harbours disruptive forces within itself which—as in Greece or ancient India or in France of the eighteenth century or in modern Capitalist States—are bound to erupt sooner or later and overthrow the unstable equilibrium of society. Such a state of affairs is, moreover, unsatisfactory and undesirable from the point of view of the so-called cultured classes themselves, because for them culture becomes merely an avenue of escape from life, a mere distraction, a pastime in which to seek refuge from the inanity and the futility of their selfish and socially useless lives unrelated to the joys and sorrows, the triumphs and failures or the struggles and achievements of their fellow-men. No generous emotion stirs their frozen hearts, no creative social ideal throws their minds into a ferment. They are like the deaf and the dumb and the mentally paralysed, of whom the Quran says :

"They have hearts but they understand not, eyes but they see not, ears but they hear not. They are like the beasts of the jungle or even more misdirected."

It is idle to expect such a class culture nurtured in ivory towers, based on selfish individualism and isolated from the life of the community, ever to produce great art or literature or philosophy.

The greatest defect and offence of a class culture is that consciously or unconsciously it wastes the talent and creative

capacity which is by nature not confined to any particular class or group but is possessed by the community in general. If large sections of the population are completely, or almost completely, deprived of cultural facilities, what likelihood is there of the people throwing up great leaders of thought and action or producing distinguished artists or scientists? Of course, in spite of all these discouraging handicaps, occasionally they do throw up dynamic figures in various walks of life. But the number of such people is infinitesimal when compared to the waste of talent that has been going on for centuries—in fact, since the dawn of civilized society—for want of opportunities of self-expression to millions of people. It is impossible for most people to realize how infinitely richer and more significant life would be if all existing and potential talent could be pressed into the service of human culture. Now, this division of society into those who work and produce and those who play and enjoy is psychologically and fundamentally unsound. Yet it has been the undisputed foundation of our culture and social order for centuries and it has produced disastrous results. It is obviously impossible for a man or a woman who suffers from poverty, ignorance or an ever-present sense of economic insecurity to devote himself or herself to any cultural pursuits. They would not, in the first instance, have the leisure or the opportunity to do so at all, but even if they had, the spirit might be willing but the flesh would be weak. All this adds immensely to the sense of frustration and waste and futility which is a feature of our society today.

Corresponding to this dualism between culture and economics is the antithesis of culture and ethics. Artists and their like have been apt to regard themselves as unconcerned with, if not above, ethical considerations

altogether. "Art for the sake of Art" and "Culture for the sake of Culture" have been their watchwords, and they have tended to ignore the fact that both art and culture spring out of the creative soil of Life, which is one and indivisible, and that no arbitrary divisions like art and economics and ethics can be imposed on life without seriously impairing its integrality, its unity and its value. Man too has an integral individuality which, like life, cannot be split in twain. His education and culture, his economic training, and his ethical orientation must all be regarded as a single indivisible process if our object is to produce a balanced individual and a harmonious social order. Wherever this guiding principle is disregarded, individual and collective life suffer from tension, conflict and disequilibrium. Now, if it is conceded that every man has a body as well as a spirit—in whatever terms you may describe the physical and psychological aspects of his being—it becomes necessary that every man should have both bread as well as culture for the satisfaction of his twin wants. An individual who concentrates only on bread-winning or the accumulation of wealth is less than a complete human being, because the whole world of art, culture, poetry and thought, except in its commercial application, remains a sealed book to him. Similarly, the individual who cuts himself off from all productive labour and fails to establish contact with his fellow-beings in their most characteristic life-activities and is preoccupied solely with the playthings of culture becomes socially inefficient, and even as an artist he is likely to be superficial because he cannot derive inspiration and strength from the pulsating life around him. Thus psychology and ethics combine to stress the demand that the equitable sharing of goods and services and of culture and education should be made obligatory in any reasonable social order,

and social justice, which is the basis of all practical ethics, is seen to be intimately connected with the problem of culture—its creation, preservation and transmission. We must establish conditions which will afford to all, and not merely to a section of the people, equality of opportunity to share in the good things of life, both material and cultural. Our existing culture is lop-sided and ailing because our social order has alienated culture both from economics and ethics and it has not implemented the principle of a just distribution of the cultural and material goods which the wit of man can now produce in far greater abundance than before. There may have been some justification in the past for the poverty and deprivations which have characterized the life of mankind in earlier ages. They were ages not of plenty but of scarcity and men had to fight with their neighbours in order to secure a livelihood for themselves. But thanks to the industrial revolution and the progress of science which has brought the forces of Nature under the control of man, there is absolutely no justification now for society to condemn a large majority of its members to lead a life unworthy even of beasts of the jungle. If these conditions still persist—and they have, in fact, become worse than before—the reason for this must be sought not in the physical conditions besetting man or the limitations of his knowledge but in the unregenerate, uncultured and ethically uneducated nature of man himself who has failed to exploit his great powers for the expansion and enrichment of life. So, unless the principle of social justice underlies the dealings and activities of man in all departments of life, it will be impossible to create conditions favourable to the development of individuality or to produce the elements of the good social order, and life, rich with promise, will remain barren and unfulfilled.

Let us now try and assess the new elements in our social order which have a direct significance for the culture that is to develop in future. Briefly, they may be summed up as the application of science to the problems of life. Through the study of natural phenomena and the application of the deductive method, man has added step by step to his understanding of the laws operating in the world of Nature, and from understanding he has passed on to the control of the forces of Nature. This process has been going on slowly and steadily for thousands of years, but during the last 150 years it has been accelerated beyond the dreams of the past and today, instead of waiting patiently and somewhat humbly on Nature to reveal her secrets, man goes ahead purposefully and confidently to wrest these secrets from her and compels her to obey his imperious will and become an instrument for the exploitation of her own treasures. Two major consequences have followed from the series of changes that this new situation has brought about. Firstly, the tempo of life has been quickened as never before and no static concepts, either of life or culture, can fit into the present framework. Secondly, for the first time in the history of civilization, man finds himself in control of forces which make it possible for him to usher in an age of plenty, instead of the ages of poverty and precarious living through which mankind has been passing for thousands of years. Since life has become dynamic and subject to swift change, culture must also assume a new dynamism; it can no longer rest on tradition and precedent but must forge ahead according to the spirit of the times. Of course, in a sense, culture has always been changing but those changes have been slow, unperceived and unconscious. Today, change is the essence of life and our culture has to be forward-looking, taking within its ambit the new forces and tendencies that

have come into being. The old academic, individualistic and nationalistic concepts of culture are an anachronism in this age of science, industrialism and increased international contacts. With the incursion of science into all the departments of our life, a culture that remains complacently aloof from and indifferent to science and its achievements and to the infinitely precious spirit of the scientific method, is apparently lop-sided and incomplete. The culture of the future must, therefore, reckon with the insistent knocking of this new comer at the gate and somehow reconcile its claims with those of the older disciplines and the humanities that we have inherited as a precious legacy from the past. The knowledge of the sciences is necessary in order to build the structure of our material life on fruitful and solid foundations; the knowledge of the scientific method is necessary because that is our only protection against superstition, intellectual obscurantism and the tyranny of effete and outmoded traditions. Modern culture must, therefore, assimilate science—not, indeed, in the sense that every cultured man must also be a man of science but that he should appreciate the broad implications and significance of science for human life and cultivate the qualities that social life founded on science postulates.

What, you might ask, are these qualities? Firstly, the study of science reveals the fact that man's control over the 'forces' of Nature is not the result of the efforts made by one particular group or race or country but is the cumulative result of the co-operative efforts of generations of known and unknown workers belonging to different races and countries. A scientific mind, properly trained, cannot, and should not, be parochial or narrowly nationalistic in its outlook. Secondly, science gives man the confidence that with his trained and disciplined intellect he can shape his destiny

and that he is no longer the plaything of blind and dreaded elemental forces. These two moral implications of the scientific attitude—the co-operative nature of human achievement and the dynamic role of man—must become an integral part of a cultured mind if man is to play his role worthily in the modern world. The culture of the future must, therefore, be dynamic and co-operative; it must transcend the artificial frontiers that divide man from man and it must also give free play to his critical intellect.

For the development of culture, there is one other condition which must be fulfilled. Culture, by its very nature, can flourish only in an atmosphere of freedom which is the very breath of its life. Where political authority restricts freedom of thought in any direction, intellectual development is arrested and free and frank exchange of ideas, on which all progress ultimately depends, becomes impossible. Most States and many ecclesiastical authorities have, in various ages, tried to fetter the play of free thought in order to maintain their power and privileges; for nothing is so repugnant or dangerous to vested interests, whether secular or religious, as free thought. A classic modern example of a regimented culture is Nazi Germany where the all-powerful totalitarian State compelled culture to sacrifice freedom and integrity at its blood-stained altar. Science was allowed freedom not to pursue its quest for truth about Nature but to conferring a more deadly efficiency on all the instruments of modern warfare; philosophy was allowed freedom not to speculate about the ultimate problems of life and values but to justify the political creed of the party in power and prove its superiority over all other political concepts; biology was likewise a medium for showing to the credulous masses that the doctrine of Nordic superiority was not the figment of a

perverted brain but an established scientific fact. All this and more was openly and unashamedly practised in Nazi Germany but it was by no means confined to it. In varying degrees, we can find its manifestations in practically every country. But the result is always the same. Wherever the development, enrichment and diffusion of culture is repressed in the interest of a party or a programme or a political philosophy, it cannot discharge its real function of liberating the human mind from its prejudices, prepossessions and fanaticisms. If the future is to be better, more spacious and more humane than the past, then the spirit of a humanized culture must pervade all the activities of life. That is why, in spite of all its drawbacks, a democracy, where a certain measure of individual freedom is ensured, is more congenial to culture than an autocratic or totalitarian State, and as democracy is widened and deepened to afford a genuine, and not merely nominal, equality of opportunity, it will provide favourable soil for the evolution of a humane culture shared in common.

We are now in a position to outline some of the important characteristics of the new culture that we should like to see. As we have seen, it will not be an anaemic, hot-house growth cultivated by a select few as a jealously guarded preserve but a culture that is closely associated with productive work, arts and crafts and socially shared experiences. This will only be possible when the present structure of society, with its startling contrasts of wealth and poverty of opportunity and deprivation, is radically altered and socially useful labour is recognized by law and public opinion as the duty and privilege of every citizen. At present a majority of people do all the work, often of the nature of monotonous drudgery, without having any leisure to spend in culturally worth-while activities, while there is

a minority which either does no work at all or whose work is merely the exploitation of other people's brains or labour and the raking in of profits. This minority which does no socially useful work has a great deal of leisure and some of its members occupy themselves by cultivating various arts and patronizing various cultural activities. This cleavage between those who work and those who enjoy leisure is utterly uncongenial to the emergence and development of a living national culture. The culture that I visualize for the future would postulate that productive work—which includes the production of goods and services as well as the promotion of knowledge and science and arts and crafts—should be shared by all members of society and not be confined to any particular class or group. It would further ensure that by the application of science to industry and the productive processes mere drudgery would as far as possible be eliminated and the machine would take on much of the back-breaking work which still presses heavily on people in industrially backward countries and is repugnant to human dignity. The flush system, for instance, has done away in many places—and can do so in all places—with the degrading manual work now done by millions of sweepers and scavengers. Tractors can do most of the heavier work associated with agriculture. In Soviet Russia and some other countries, the gasification of coal has largely obviated the necessity of working underground in coal mines for long hours under the most dangerous and unhygienic of conditions. Science holds out the possibility not only of releasing man from most forms of drudgery but also of its being done far more quickly than is the case at present. It has been calculated by experts that on the basis of our present knowledge and technique we can get all the work of the world done, provided it is rationally planned and

equitably shared, by working four hours a day and six days a week.

This would naturally involve a gradual and progressive increase in leisure and the problem of using it for, the enrichment of human personality would assume a new importance. It would then be the business of education to ensure that all citizens are trained mentally and emotionally to participate in those "realms of gold" where culture abides and which certain privileged classes have monopolized at present. It should not, however, be a case of work plus culture—long hours of uninteresting work at the factory followed by reading of poetry or talks about art or study of books in evening classes. No, the idea is more fundamental. Culture should be freed from its exclusive confinement to the world of books and we must learn to seek it through other channels and avenues also, like productive work, arts and crafts, science, industries and agriculture. This is not a Utopian dream; true culture in the broader sense of the word is a natural product of all socially useful work, performed with sincerity and integrity and with a proper appreciation of its technical and sociological significance. If the worker is a mere cog in the wheel and knows neither the scientific nor social bearings of his work, he cannot gain any cultural advantages out of it and his leisure is spent in vain attempts to forget his boredom and ennui in cheap relaxations and amusements. But an intelligent and cultivated person, who finds constantly growing points of interest in his vocation and carries them over from the farm and the factory to his home and his club, is all the time being educated by his work, and his culture is not confined to the reading of diverting books as an escape from reality. In this way, the dualism between culture and vocation is broken down and work and play fuse into each another, as

is the case, even in our imperfect world today, with all great artists, poets, scientists, and social reformers. For them the distinction between work and leisure, between art (or science) and vocation, between making a living and developing their personality disappears. The closer we approximate to this condition in our daily life and work, the greater will be the chance for the development of true culture.

Is this conception of culture altogether too Utopian, too far-fetched, too exalted for the frailty of man as an individual and his selfishness and greed in the mass? I do not think so. The values underlying this culture—justice and fairplay between individuals and groups, freedom, democracy, the spirit of love and sympathy and the conquest of Nature—all of them have been preached consistently and in their different ways by the best and finest spirits that have lived and striven for the Kingdom of God on earth, and in the life of many individuals and in small communities, the values of such a culture have been practised and realized to some extent, though only for short periods. They were not universalized—and perhaps could not be universalized—because the material conditions and forces necessary for the purpose did not then exist. But now, with the conquests of science, the perfecting of productive techniques, the breaking down of geographical barriers and the quick transmission and intercommunication of ideas and discoveries, the achievement of a humane culture based on science and social justice has become definitely possible and it is only the greed and stupidity of man that stand in the way of his translating the possible into the actual.

May I say one thing more in conclusion? I have chosen to address you on this particular topic for a special reason. My study of history has revealed to me the fact that most of the new cultures, like many new religions, have developed

not in places and countries whose culture is over-sophisticated, conventionalized and worn out with age. They grow rather in communities whose life is closer to Nature and has not been overlaid too much with traditions, customs and habits which make men timid and conservative. They need a certain atmosphere of what I may call in good faith primitive freedom and democracy and an innate appreciation of the value of man as man. Is it too much to hope and speculate that this continent of yours, which in some ways is primitive rather than decadent, where man is nearer to Nature and more free in his outlook than in some other countries, where life, I hope, is not valued as gold is valued apprehensively by a miser but is lived adventurously, where men and women are free and equal, and values other than gold have a certain currency—is it too much to hope that amongst you the seeds of such a culture may take root and sprout, that you may perhaps prove the pioneers of a new civilization, provided you do not regard your existing culture as the last word in perfection? The war and what preceded it, and the peace and what has followed it, have given a great jolt to the conscience as well as the material and social life of mankind and thrown old institutions, customs, beliefs and traditions into the melting pot. This situation offers a great challenge and a great opportunity to all the peoples and races of the human family to reconstruct their life and culture on a more rational and equitable basis. Will you, will China, will India, will this or that country accept the challenge? Who can say? The opportunity is there; it may or may not be seized. I am not one of those who believe—like the old fatalists or the modern adherents of dialectical materialism—that historical processes move with an irresistible inevitability, that forces beyond the control of man mould his destiny and that he can do no

more than watch, more or less helplessly, the interplay of these external forces. I am an activist and believe that man plays a decisive role in shaping his future and in directing these powerful forces of history. This is truer today than it has been ever before. The great tragedy of the modern man is that there is a striking disharmony between his great scientific achievements and his moral and ethical development and, therefore, he has become an uncritical and greedy slave of these forces using them only for his selfish and narrow ends. Even if he is, sometimes, a moral man, he lives in an immoral society which denies expression to his better impulses. I am, therefore, convinced that the "Shape of Things to Come" in culture, as in other departments of life, will never augur well unless through education man becomes really worthy of his great heritage and all the social and economic factors which stand in the way are removed without undue regard for the vested interests which thrive on obscurantism and social injustice.

Perhaps it was the vision of such a noble culture that inspired our great Indian poet, Tagore, to write these immortal lines :

" Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments.
by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of truth;
Where tireless striving reaches its arms towards perfection;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way
into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;
Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever-widening
thought and action—
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country
awake."

III. INTERNATIONALISM IN THE EDUCATIONAL IDEOLOGY OF ISLAM

In undertaking to discuss with you today, in the course of a single lecture, the Educational Ideology of Islam as interpreted with masterly insight by the poet and philosopher, Iqbal, I am attempting almost the impossible and I doubt my ability to give you an adequate summary of even its most significant features. If one were discussing a theme which is familiar to one's audience, one can take a lot of things for granted and need only high-light its most essential aspects. But I am handicapped today by the fact that to a large majority of my audience "Islam" is just a word signifying the religion of the "Mohammadans" and Iqbal is probably an entirely unknown name which brings up no previous associations. It is even possible that the ideas associated with Islam in your mind may be somewhat uncomplimentary, an unhappy legacy dating back to the far off days of the Crusades when Christianity and Islam confronted each other as the two great proselytizing religions of the world and many missionaries and others were interested in presenting a dark and distorted picture of this great religion which they regarded as their chief adversary. Unfortunately we find the tradition persisting to this day so much so that, while other Asiatic religions like Buddhism and Hinduism have found many sympathetic and reverent students in Europe and America, the West continues to look askance at Islam and regards it unjustly as a religion propagated with the sword. Even a distinguished scholar like Margoliouth and a standard work like the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* make statements about Islam and its great prophet which would be ludicrous if they were not tragic, if they did not deepen the tragedy of misunderstandings and prejudices.

which make international concord so difficult today. This is all the more regrettable because as a religion Islam has always had a soft corner in its heart for Christianity and the Christians, who are described as the "People of the Book" amongst whom are to be found, according to the Quran, "persons who are responsive to truth and deeply moved by it." This attitude, not merely of tolerance but of reverence towards all other religions, is not surprising, because Islam takes an essentially evolutionary view of religion. It does not maintain that it is the only true or revealed religion while the other religions of the world are nothing but so many heresies. It is a part of the Muslim's faith that every community and every age has had its prophets and men of God who have shown their people the right path according to the needs of the times, that every new prophet has re-affirmed the basic truths taught by his predecessors and carried the torch of religion a step further and that Mohammad, the prophet of Islam, likewise completed and crystallized the great work done by earlier prophets. In the Muslim pantheon Abraham and Moses and Jesus occupy a place of special honour and a Muslim cannot but hold them in high esteem and affection. It follows from this evolutionary view of religion—so refreshingly different from the fanatical view which consigns the followers of all other religions to hell—that there can be no compulsion in religion, that every human being must have the fullest freedom of belief and worship, that any creed or doctrine imposed by force cannot, by that very fact, partake of the nature of a religious experience. Over and over again the Quran has stressed the fact that it is not the business of the prophet of Islam to compel any one to enter his fold. Religion is a matter of the individual conscience—"Your religion for you and my religion for me"—and the prophet need do nothing

more than offer to share with others the light that has been revealed to him. I stress this point at some length in order to bring out the fact that toleration, which is so essential for the sanity of the world today, is an integral part of Islam and no interpretation of its educational ideology will be satisfactory which fails to take this significant factor into account.

I am not concerned in this lecture, however, either with the defence of Islam as a religion or a discussion of its general ethical and metaphysical bases. I would like, rather, to present to you one special facet of this faith—its attitude to peace and the problem of international and inter-racial relationships, its concept of the good life and its vision of the kind of social order which must be developed if peace and goodwill are to prevail on earth and if man is to realize his great destiny. And I propose to do so, as I have already mentioned, in the light of the elucidation offered by the great Muslim poet and philosopher Iqbal. I have selected him as an appropriate guide and interpreter because he can speak to the Western mind in its own idiom and it is possible to study some of his ideas in books published in the English language. Let me, therefore, preface my remarks by introducing to you Iqbal the man, so that you may better understand and appreciate his ideas.

Sir Mohammad Iqbal, who died a few years ago, was the greatest Urdu and Persian poet of India during the twentieth century. But to him poetry was not just a pleasant aesthetic indulgence or diversion; it was essentially a vehicle for the expression of his dynamic and creative thought. He received his higher education both in India and in Europe. He took the Honours degree in Philosophy from Cambridge, was called to the Bar in London and obtained the Doctorate

of Philosophy from Munich. He served as a Professor of Philosophy and English for some years at a Government College but later started his practice at the Bar which he continued, rather half-heartedly, till his last years. He also entered the Legislative Council for a term of years and took part in politics, being elected President of the Muslim League in 1931 and represented India at one of the Round Table Conferences in London. But all these were side lines, so to speak; they did not touch the deepest springs of his extraordinary personality. For he was essentially a thinker and philosopher who happily chose poetry as the medium of his self-expression; his mind was a powerful searchlight whose rays could illumine the darkest corners of human nature and destiny. The purity of diction and technical perfection of his verse marked a new stage in the development of Indian poetry. But what was infinitely more important than technical excellence was the fact that through his dynamic poetry he was able to exercise a profound formative influence on the minds and emotions of the older as well as the younger generation. He gave them a new hope and a new courage to accept the challenge of life and preached the gospel of creative effort and activity to a people who had become enervated through their ancient philosophy of renunciation and inaction.

The evolution of Iqbal's thought provides an interesting recapitulation of the evolutionary process which we find operating in the development of the human mind. In its early phase, his poetry was rational and patriotic, in the healthy sense of the word, extolling the natural beauties and the cultural achievements of his country. In the next phase we find him turning more definitely to themes dealing with Muslim life and culture and Muslim ideals and values and the rise and fall of Muslim society. In other words,

he had now transcended geographical and national frontiers and instead of confining his attention to one geographical unit he took as his field the entire world of Islam, embracing people of different races and complexions and countries. The cementing force between these different Muslim communities of the world was not attachment to a particular soil but allegiance to certain ideals and values. It was, therefore, a process of the broadening and enrichment of his poetic vision. The final phase of his poetic development was what may be described as "humanism"; he is not now interested exclusively or predominantly in Muslims but in humanity as such, anxious to see that all men and women realize their possibilities and discover the divine spark in themselves. In attempting to introduce this great poet and thinker to you, I am inspired by the hope that you will learn to appreciate something of his world vision, his progressive outlook and his enlightened humanism which are so essential for the sanity and security of a world rent asunder by racial fanaticism and national exclusiveness. It is well to remember that even when Iqbal is discussing Islamic culture and religion he is concerned with bringing out their general and universal aspects and elucidating their bearings on the contemporary human scene. When he first published his long Persian poems entitled *Secrets of the Self* and *Mysteries of Selflessness*, dealing with the values of Islamic culture as applied to the individual and the community, he was criticized for narrowing down his vision from the world of mankind to the world of Islam. His reply was: "The object of my Persian poems is not to plead for Islam. I am keenly interested in the search for a better social order, and in this quest it is impossible for me to ignore an actually existing social system the main object of which is to abolish all distinctions of race, caste

and colour." Iqbal advocates a social order built on the broadest humanistic foundations, where distinction of caste, creed and colour will not be allowed to disrupt the intrinsic unity of mankind preached by Islam and passionately accepted by Iqbal as both a fact and an ideal. He is poignantly conscious of the dangers inherent in the rising tide of nationalism, racialism and tribalism, which is basically repugnant to the genius of Islam, and he pleads for the establishment of a society based on equality, fraternity and social justice. Naturally, as a Muslim deeply versed in Islamic culture and philosophy and appreciative of their worth, he derives his inspiration from Islam, just as the exponents of Western culture interpret it—in fact, often interpret all culture!—in terms of the Hellenistic tradition and the Christian values. What is important from the world point of view is not the precise source of the inspiration but its nature and its general trend and it is a matter for thankfulness and hope for the future that, starting from entirely different premises and points of view, the best and finest minds of the world should arrive at similar conclusions about the basic values of life and the destiny of man on earth. In this kinship of ends notwithstanding the difference of approach lies the promise of salvation for the world.

The starting point in Iqbal's philosophy as in Muslim thought in general is his respect for individuality, his belief that this individuality is the most precious asset in life and its full and free and effective development is the end of education and all other social agencies and institutions. Iqbal believes that the whole course of evolution is guided by the unconscious urge to develop individuality in all living organisms. "Throughout the entire gamut of being," he remarks, "runs the rising note of egohood till it reaches its

perfection in man." In the words of the Quran, "Man is the trustee of a free personality which he accepted at his peril"—for freedom is always beset with risks—and the "unceasing reward of man consists in his gradual growth in self-possession, in uniqueness and intensity of his activity as an ego." This self or individuality, however, is not a datum as many people are inclined to believe, but a matter of achievement through strenuous personal effort and struggle against the forces of the environment. That is why Iqbal advocates not the retired life of the recluse, which offers no challenge to the manifold powers of the individual, but a life of active striving dedicated to worthy purposes and exploiting all the resources of the environment for their realization. Iqbal asks us to welcome all experience, not to withdraw into isolation; for the true joy of life is to be found not in watching the performance from the spectators' gallery, as it were, but in throwing oneself wholeheartedly into the fray and making every experience, pleasant or unpleasant, contribute to the growth and enrichment of the self. In his own beautiful words:

"Feast not on the shore, for there
Softly breathes the tune of life.
Grapple with the waves and dare !
Immortality is strife !"

Now the primary question for the educationist is: How can this individuality be best developed? The answer briefly is "Through action." Unlike many other Eastern and Western philosophers and priests who regard a life of contemplation as essential for self-development, Iqbal believes that the life of the ego consists in a kind of tension between it and the environment, which sets up between them a dynamic and educative relationship. It is not the process of an individual passively adapting himself to a static

environment but a creative process in which man must play an active role, "now by adjusting himself to its forces, now by putting the whole of his energy to mould its forces to his own end and purpose. And in this process of progressive change God becomes a co-worker of man, provided man takes the initiative. If he does not take the initiative, if he does not evolve the inner richness of his being, if he ceases to feel the inward rush of advancing life, the spirit within him turns into stone and he is reduced to the level of dead matter." Thus, for the active and creative individual, life is a continuous and exciting experiment in living—not the dead repetition of a given pattern but a creative activity in which the elements of novelty and originality are involved. Iqbal has also defined the nature of the environment congenial to the growth of the self and the condition under which the individual can best achieve full self-expression. The self unfolds itself naturally when it feeds on, and draws its inspiration from the cultural riches and achievements of the community to which it belongs. It must learn to understand, assimilate and critically reconstruct that culture, adhering steadfastly to its highest values and traditions. He criticizes Indian education strongly for its slavish imitation of the West; it was based on borrowed ideas, on the intellectual resources of a foreign culture and the cramping use of a foreign language. True education must aim at revitalizing the sources of the people's culture and using its riches to quicken their creative activity and enriching their individuality. It is only people firmly entrenched in their own culture who can appreciate and benefit from the valuable contribution to world culture made by other peoples. On the other hand, if they go out as mendicants, they will remain mentally barren and spiritually poor:

“Look into thine own clay for the fire that is missing, It is not worth while asking for the light of others!”

Secondly, the unfolding of an individual's latent possibilities can best take place in an atmosphere of freedom. Creativity, which is man's highest attribute, and originality, which is a condition precedent for all progressive change, need freedom for their cultivation. This fact has far-reaching implications both for intellectual and moral education. Since the world in which we live is constantly changing and developing as a result of man's creative activity, it becomes necessary to cultivate his critical intelligence by adopting methods of self-activity and learning by doing—methods which confront the students with new situations and problems and give them the opportunity to fit means to ends, to rely on their groping but purposeful efforts and to learn through the experimental method of trial and error. Similarly, moral education is envisaged differently, and not as passive conformity on the part of the individual to a rigidly superimposed moral code, to the detriment of the role which individual thought and intellectual activity play in the process of achieving a moral personality. Iqbal's view in this matter is clear: “Goodness is not a matter of compulsion; it is the self's surrender to the moral ideas and arises out of a willing co-operation of free egos. A being whose movements are wholly determined cannot produce goodness. Freedom is, therefore, seen to be a condition of goodness.” It is significant that Iqbal has specially recognized the intrinsic relationship between moral and social behaviour and holds that morality cannot be taught or learnt in isolation; it arises out of “the willing co-operation of free egos.”

Thus we find that the central fact in the educational ideology of Islam is the growth of individuality—not in this

or that class or group but in all men and women, because they are the repositories of the divine trust and the divine spark. This individuality is best developed through purposeful activity in an atmosphere of freedom and in close, life-giving contact with the culture of the community. It is neither wholly matter nor wholly spirit but is the product of interaction between the ideal and the real, between the physical and the mental; it rejects definitely the dualism between *Alam-i-Afad* (the world of matter) and *Alam-i-Anfus* (the world of spirit). It is through fruitful contacts with his environment that man has sharpened the sword of his intellect, has won his amazing ascendancy over the world of Nature and built up the great structure of his civilization and culture. Islam is "not afraid of contact with matter" and rejects asceticism as an ideal, and accepting the challenge of life, it greets the world of matter and exhorts us to use its resources for the service of the highest ends of the spirit. Iqbal makes this clear in the language of poetic symbolism:

"O heart! Look for the secret of Life in the bud ;
 For Reality is revealed in its Appearance.
 It grows out of the darkness of the earth
 But its gaze is fixed on the lustre of the sun."

But Islam does not favour nor does Iqbal agree with the rank materialistic view that denies the supremacy of the spirit and finds the entire meaning of life in terms of the material and the physical. In the words of Iqbal: "It is the mysterious touch of the ideal that animates and sustains the real—and not *vice versa*—and he goes on to point out: "The ultimate Reality, according to the Quran, is spiritual and its life consists in its temporal activity. The spirit finds its opportunity in the natural, the material and the secular. All that is secular is, therefore, sacred in the roots

of its being. . . . There is no such thing as a profane world. All this immensity of matter constitutes a scope for the realization of the spirit. As the Quran so beautifully puts it: "The whole of this earth is a mosque."

The conscious purpose of education should, therefore, be to ensure that modern man is not betrayed into the temptation of subordinating the mental to the physical and so concentrating on the effort to gain the whole world as to lose his own soul. The problem of moral and religious education is consequently lifted to an altogether different and higher plane. "It is not a question of morality or religion being superimposed, as a decorative after-thought, on a life that is essentially secular; it must be woven into the very texture of a man's life and he must live as if in very truth this earth were a mosque! We must remember that his creativity is not confined to the reshaping of matter alone; he has also "the capacity to build a much vaster world in the depths of his own being, wherein he discovers sources of infinite joy and inspiration"—in art and literature, science and craftsmanship, philosophy and religion. He cannot, therefore, in the interests of his own fulfilment, sacrifice these riches of the spirit at the altar of a crass materialism. "The relation of man to Nature must be exploited," Iqbal warns us, "in the interest not of unrighteous desire but in the nobler interest of a free, upward movement of spiritual life"—a warning which we will do well to take to heart in an age so sorely beset by capitalism, imperialism, racialism, the colour bar and all other tendencies which deny the spirit that unites and exalt greed and mammon worship which separate and divide. No education will be worth anything if it fails to strengthen in man this conviction of the primacy of the spirit and teaches him to exploit the world of matter in its behalf. This is really the

Great Anomaly of the modern age—the staggering increase in man's power over Nature and in his material riches and his pitiful failure to control himself and harness his powers to the service of worthy ends. Every great contemporary thinker has stressed this tragic disparity between man's scientific advance and his moral immaturity. This is how Iqbal describes the dilemma of the modern man:

“Love has vanished and Intellect bites him like a
snake,
 Man has failed to bring Reason under the sway of Love ;
 He has succeeded in tracing the stars in their courses
 But failed to pick his way in the labyrinth of his Ideas!
 He has got so entangled in the maze of his Knowledge
 That he is unable to distinguish Profit from Loss!
 He has ensnared the rays of the Sun
 But failed to illumine the dark night of his Life!”

How is man to triumph over this disastrous situation which threatens to turn the fruits of his intellectual activity into veritable grapes of wrath? Iqbal's views on this matter may strike men with Western education as interesting if unfamiliar. We find in his philosophy a strain of revolt against the “over-intellectualism” of modern thought. He believes with Bergson that contemporary thought has overstressed the intellect at the expense of intuition which, in his characteristic sense, he designates as *Ishq* or love. There is, he says, the piecemeal perception of reality through the senses and the analytic intellect and the direct perception of reality through intuition (or the “heart” as Eastern mystics and poets have called it) which enables us to enter into and grasp the meaning of reality as an indivisible whole, even as we apprehend the meaning of a picture or a symphony. Iqbal holds that unless man stages a come-back from the chill regions of an arid intellectualism

to the warmth of love and intuition he will not be able to find his way out of the impasse in which he is placed. He has been so overwhelmed by the triumphant materialism of the age and the achievements of modern science that he is unable to appreciate the values associated with love and intuition which are also the bases of the religious experience. Intellect uninspired by love and science uncontrolled by faith in ethical principles have given to the West a ruthless economic system, an unjust social order, a bitter legacy of class conflicts, a craze for armaments and a perpetual threat of imminent war. That is why modern life is beset with hurry, strain, frustration and an incapacity or distaste for the quiet enjoyment of the genuine fruits of culture. In Iqbal's own words: "The modern man, with his philosophies of criticism and scientific specialism, finds himself in a strange predicament. His naturalism has given him an unprecedented control over the forces of Nature but has robbed him of his faith in his own future..... Wholly overshadowed by the results of his intellectual activity, he has ceased to live soulfully, i. e. from within. In the domain of thought, he is living in open conflict with himself, and in the domain of economic and political life, he is living in open conflict with others. He finds himself unable to control his ruthless energy and infinite gold hunger which is gradually killing all higher striving in him and bringing him nothing but life-weariness." Iqbal's supreme objective is to bring about a *rapprochement* between power, born of knowledge, and vision, born of love or intuition. "vision without power," he explains, "brings moral elevation but cannot give permanent culture. Power without vision tends to become destructive and inhuman. Both must combine for the spiritual expansion of humanity and the fullness of man's life."

“A single uncontrolled manifestation of Intellect may set
the whole world ablaze

Tutored by Love it can illuminate the Universe.”

The East and the West have alike suffered from the divorce between these two great values of life. “The East had the vision of God but failed to perceive the world of matter; the West lost itself in the world of matter and shied away from the vision!” Their fusion is necessary, firstly, for the enrichment and strengthening of individuality, for love casteth out fear and brings about an amazing concentration and intensification of powers, increasing them a hundred-fold. Abraham offering his only son as a sacrifice to the Lord, Christ on the Cross, the Prophet's grandson Husain courting martyrdom on the field of Karbala and defying the whole world in the cause of Truth and Justice—these and all other great martyrs and heroes of humanity seem to achieve the seemingly impossible because love has transformed them; they have intuitively perceived their relationship to humanity and to God and what appears to the critical intellect as sacrifice is to them only self-fulfilment. Love enables them to conquer death and to achieve immortality. This conquest of death by love is, for Iqbal, no mere metaphor but a profoundly important fact which education dare not ignore. He once expressed this remarkable idea to me in a letter in these memorable words: “If immortality is a fact, no educational system need bother about it. If it is an achievement open to the ego, no educational system—that does not aim at training pure intellect only—can afford to ignore it.” To Iqbal's way of thinking, immortality, like most other great things in life, is obviously something to be achieved; it is only “as an ever-increasing ego” that, according to the Quran, man can “belong to the meaning of the universe” and become

immortal. "Personal immortality, then, is not given to every one as a matter of right; man is only a candidate for it. His ego must continue to struggle throughout life till he is able to gather himself up and win resurrection." Need I underline the great difference which separates the conception of education as a quest for immortality from one which regards money-making and careerism as its supreme objective?

Let us now turn to examine what type of human being this education aims at producing, for it is his quality and character which ultimately determine the fate of the community. As we have seen, Iqbal is an Individualist and he has pointed out forcibly and frequently that "the ultimate fate of people does not depend so much on organization as on the worth and power of individual men." In an over-organized society, an individual may gain the whole world but lose his own soul. . . The only effective power, therefore, that counteracts the forces of decay in a people is "the rearing of self-concentrated individuals—they alone reveal the depths of life and disclose new standards in the light of which we begin to see that our environment is not wholly inviolable and requires revision." This being his view of the creative role of man in the Universe, we should be able to sketch the profile of the "good man" as seen by Iqbal—the self-concentrated individual in whom vision and power have fused together into a vital and light-giving unity—and to define the characteristics of the "good life" which he needs for his fulfilment. The life of the "good man" must, in the first instance, be a life of active effort and struggle—not an activity running in routine patterns but original and creative activity which would enable man to transform this crude world and fill it with order and beauty. This emphasis on the creative quality of the good character runs like a constant refrain through his poetry:

"Glowing with the light of self as thou art
 Make self strong and thou wilt endure.
 Knowing as I do the harmony of life
 I will reveal to thee its hidden secret—
 'Tis to sink into thyself like the pearl,
 Then to emerge from thine inward solitude;
 What is life but to be freed from moving round others
 And to regard oneself as the Holy Temple."

Secondly, the good man must learn to apply his intelligence increasingly to the exploitation of the forces of Nature and thereby add to his power of control over them:

"Intellect rules supreme over the Earth and the Heavens,
 There is nothing that lies beyond its sway;
 The entire Universe is subject to its eternal glory—
 'Tis the Heart alone that is ever at variance with it!"

It is, therefore, necessary that a reconciliation should be brought about between the intellect and the heart, and love, which presides over the human heart, should govern his conduct—not as a vague humanitarian sentiment but as an active force conferring on him a sense of kinship with his Maker and his fellow-men and giving him the courage to live his life in the name of the Lord. Thus equipped with an active, intelligent and love-inspired individuality, with faith in himself and his God, rating himself high and contemptuously refusing to compromise with evil and falsehood or bow to any unjust earthly power, sensitive to the appeal of ideal values and strong in the determination to realize them, man becomes an irresistible power for good and a co-worker with God in working out His purposes on earth.

In order to develop such a character Iqbal specially pleads for the cultivation of three basic qualities through education—Courage, Tolerance and what he calls *Faqr*.

He regards courage as a condition precedent for all great achievements because it enables man to face the perils that beset his arduous journey in life. Fear, which is the negation of courage, is an inhibitory emotion which not only weakens the self but is the parent of all the vices characteristic of the weak: deceit, cowardice, flattery, meanness and hypocrisy. In fact, even such exhibitions of brute strength as bullying, political tyranny, the race for armaments, unjust economic laws or devices as suppression of new ideas are, in reality, veiled and distorted expressions of fear. It must, therefore, be eradicated both from the individual's character and from the life of the community. Thus Iqbal saw, long before President Roosevelt, that "freedom from fear" is one of the fundamental freedoms which must be assured to mankind, if man is to achieve normal development. But he went further and pointed out how it was to be done. If faith in *Tawhid*—the Unity of God—which is the first article of a Muslim's religious creed, becomes an active working principle of our conduct, it enables us to shed all fear except the fear of the Lord—which has been well described as "the beginning of wisdom"—and adopt an attitude of manly defiance towards all those powers which threaten to arrest our free development and the exercise of our legitimate human rights. It should bring in its wake a sense of freedom from bondage to other deities, whether religious or secular, and deliverance from the many irrational fears and superstitions which dominate our lives. For he who truly acknowledges no superior authority or suzerain power but God cannot bow down before the numerous tin-gods which have the presumption to claim man's loyalty.

The second essential attribute of the "good character" is the quality of tolerance which is obviously necessary in

any scheme of thought which lays stress on individuality. In a totalitarian regime, where all men and women are pressed in a uniform mould, and individuality, which may lead to originality of action and outlook, is not a desideratum, tolerance is irrelevant—for the simple reason that there are no fundamental differences to tolerate! But if our social objective is to develop individuality in all the members of a community, possibly leading to differences in outlook, behaviour and beliefs, tolerance is a condition of civilized living. Without it civilized life would not be possible and the law of the jungle would prevail. "The principle of the ego-sustaining deed," Iqbal remarks, "is respect for the ego in myself as well as in others" which means that unless education strengthens our sense of respect for the individuality of others—their opinions and beliefs, their ways and manners and even their differences with us—our own individuality will remain stunted and unfulfilled. Iqbal's tolerance, however, is not the pseudo-tolerance, the sceptical indifference of the man without strong convictions, who does not care sincerely or passionately enough for any values or beliefs or ideals. His tolerance is born of strength, not of indifference—it is the tolerance of the man of faith, who has deeply cherished convictions of his own and who realizes that equal respect and consideration is due to those of others. It is in accordance with the Islamic injunction: "For you, your religion and for me, mine," which is an express command to show reverence to all religions and to recognize diversity as the handiwork of God Himself. To Iqbal, tolerance is the basis of true humanity and an essential attribute of the religious spirit.

The third quality is *faqr* which it is impossible to render into English with precision. I shall, therefore, try to elucidate its meaning as best as I can. We have seen that

Iqbal favours the active way of life leading to the conquest of the world of matter. But he has also the vision to realize that the weight of man's material possessions is apt to stifle his higher aspirations and to arrest the growth and expansion of the spirit. He is, therefore, anxious that while engaged in the conquest of his environment, man should retain an inward detachment and superiority to his material possessions, for only then can he guard himself against becoming a slave to them and use them for the enrichment, instead of the impoverishment, of his spiritual life and for the service, rather than the exploitation, of his fellow-men. It is a kind of intellectual and moral asceticism which does not, indeed, turn away from the world as a source of evil and corruption but uses it selflessly for the achievement of good and worthy ends. It makes the good man a crusader of the spirit as it were, who wields his *faqr* as a shield to protect himself from the corruptions and temptations which lie along his path. "What is it that guards the pure-minded, in power as in subjection?" asks Iqbal and his reply is: "The attribute of *faqr*, worn as an armour!" In power, it saves them from arrogance and intoxication; in subjection, it enables them to spurn the lures, temptations and snares with which a ruling power always tries cynically to corrupt the integrity and character of a subject people. It is not of the nature of a renunciation or an attitude of withdrawal, adopted because of weakness, but rather a source of integrity and idealism in the strong. It is the only saving grace that can prove the salvation of the rich and the powerful:

"No matter if you are the ruler of the land,
Forego not the quality of *faqr* at any price;
Many a man, gifted with true discernment and a clear
vision,

Becomes debased by excess of riches;

For it saps the heart of all sympathy and sensitiveness
And substitutes arrogance for gracious humility."

This then is the portrait of the good man, the "Momin," the man of God (in the wider sense), which emerges from an examination of Iqbal's poetry and the teachings of Islam. He is a person who develops his powers and strengthens his individuality through active contact with his material and cultural environment. This strong and concentrated individuality, sharpened and steeled through active experience, is then dedicated to the service of the Lord in whose name he is out to conquer the world. But, when the world lies conquered at his feet, he is strong enough to stand aloof and feel superior to the manifold temptations which weaken the moral fibre of the ordinary man. His self-respect gives him courage and adventurousness, while his tolerance and respect for the rights and personality of others make him sensitive to the claims which their common humanity makes on him. In the pursuit of his ideals he has the courage and the self-confidence to defy vested interests and forces which hinder his progress. And he is ready and anxious to share with others the good things of life—material and cultural—which have come his way. It is, no doubt, an exacting ideal of human character and, like all ideals, difficult of attainment. But it is by no means an impossible or impracticable ideal for, as Schmalhausen, an American sociologist, has remarked, in his *New Roads to Progress*: "There is much more talent and genius in the human society than any society has so far provided conditions and incentives for evoking; there is immeasurably more humaneness in the human heart than any primitive or civilized environment has yet tapped." Iqbal believes that a progressive interpretation of the ideals of Islam can provide the motive force and the incentive for a radical reconstruction of the

character of contemporary man, provided the social order is also congenial to its development in the desired direction.

Let us, therefore, turn to a brief consideration of the main characteristics of the social order of Islam. There are certain characteristics of this order which are of special importance for us because they have a direct bearing on the central problem which we are discussing, i.e. Education for International Understanding. The first is its unambiguous declaration of the unity of the human race, an unreserved acceptance of the truth that it is "One world" centuries before Wendell Willkie thought of that arresting phrase. Islam regards the entire human race as a single family and refuses to accept the distinctions of caste, creed and colour which are at best convenient marks of identification, not badges of honour or dishonour. In the scheme of Islamic values, honour belongs neither to race nor to family nor to nationality. "The most honourable amongst you," says the Quran, "is he who is most upright and God-fearing;" and whatever crimes may have been committed in the history of Muslim countries, it is a matter of some gratification that they have been least affected by colour or race fanaticism. Here also Iqbal finds the basis of world unity in the principle of *Tawhid*—faith in one God which is not a matter of mere religious dogma but has far-reaching social, political and ethical consequences. An acceptance of this fact "demands loyalty to God and not to thrones. And since God is the ultimate spiritual basis of all life, loyalty to God virtually amounts to loyalty to one's own ideal nature." This new vision thus involves the recognition of the infinite worth of every individual, in the Kantian sense, and the rejection of blood-relationship, which Iqbal calls "earth-rootedness," as the basis of human unity. Instead, the search for a purely psychological foundation of

human unity becomes possible with the perception of the spiritual nature of human life and man is able to think in terms of wider and nobler loyalties transcending the petty and restricted loyalties which tend to divide mankind into warring camps. The religious basis of Islamic society is its belief in the Unity of God and the brotherhood of man—brotherhood which implies equality of rights and privileges for all, irrespective of race or sex or creed or colour or social and economic status. To mankind enslaved by cruel bonds of its own making, exploited by prince as well as priest and doomed largely to a state of slavery and social deprivation, Prophet Mohammad brought a message of freedom, justice and equality; and so far as social democracy could be visualized at the time, it was implicit in his teaching. The entire weight of the legislative sanctions in Islamic law is thrown on the side of redressing inequalities and injustices and upholding the rights of the weak and the oppressed against the strong. The abolition of usury, the prohibition of gambling whether on the stock exchange or in private life, the institution of *Zakat* and *Khums* which provided for compulsory and well-organized social charity, the law of inheritance which works against the accumulation of large fortunes and properties, the recognition of the rights of women and slaves, and the complete repudiation of the colour prejudice—all these tended towards the concept of an equalitarian society, even though it could not be fully achieved. They made for mobility of social intercourse and rendered the general idea of democracy acceptable. If it is granted that a living system of education must take into account the ideological foundations as well as the culture-patterns of the society or the community that it aspires to serve, then Islamic education must, indeed, dedicate itself to the strengthening of the

sense of social solidarity, the breaking down of the social, economic and geographical barriers which herd human beings into mutually exclusive folds and the inculcation of the idea of common responsibility for common welfare. It should enjoin the importance of sharing fairly with one's fellow-men the good things of life, not merely because justice demands it but because the best things in life can be truly enjoyed only through sharing—art and literature, work and leisure, culture and affection. It is a pre-condition of social health in a community that all its members should have reasonable material security and cultural opportunity and they should feel that this is a matter of joint responsibility which may only be ignored at great peril to all. Islam has stressed in particular the importance of this consciousness of common responsibility for the weal and woe of the body politic. As the Quran puts it: "And beware of the conflagration which, if it bursts out, will not be confined specially to those who have been guilty but will sweep all in its embrace." The educational corollary of such a society would be what may be called an equalitarian education, i.e. an education which recognizes no arbitrary class distinctions but provides equality of opportunity for all so that no talent may be lost through neglect or ignorance and society may be enriched by the development of all individual potentialities.

On the political side, this social order is international rather than national and it does not recognize the claims of race or geography to dictate and circumscribe people's loyalties. What binds together a number of people into a community is their ideological affinity, their ideas and sentiments, their outlook on life, not the colour of their skin or the latitude and longitude of their habitation on earth. Territorial nationalism and aggressive racialism, which have

become so accentuated of late, strike at the root of political sanity and are repugnant to the entire genius and spirit of Islam and Iqbal is one of the noble band of thinkers—like Tagore and Gandhi and Wells and Russell and Rolland and Sinclair—who have condemned narrow patriotism and nationalism as sins against the spirit of man. He condemns Machiavelli because:

“His religion exalted the state into a deity
And his thought made evil appear as good;
He kissed the feet of this unholy god
And tested Truth at the touchstone of Profit!”

He condemns the tendency to subordinate all values and loyalties to the interests of a particular race or country which found its culmination in the political doctrines of Nazism and Fascism:

“They have disrupted the idea of human fraternity
And built the structure of the community on a geographical basis;
When the country is installed as the only beacon light,
Mankind is split up into tribes;
Humanity has become a mere fable
And man a stranger to man!
The soul has escaped from the body, leaving only the
corpse behind,
Humanity is lost—only the nations remain!”

When mankind persists in worshipping at the altars of these false and evil gods, the result is always the same—the senseless slaughter of humanity at the feet of these Molochs and the sacrifice of the higher values for selfish and inhuman ends.

Finally, the social order of Islam is a dynamic order, fully alive and responsive to the great fact of “Change” which Iqbal regards as a basic phenomenon of modern life.

While stressing the value of eternal principles which regulate the collective life of society and make for stability and balance in a world of perpetual change, he is careful to point out that these principles should "not exclude all possibilities of change, which, according to the Quran, is one of the greatest signs of God." Otherwise it will "tend to immobilize what is essentially mobile in its nature. . . . The social order of Islam should not be allowed to become static, sticking to the letter that killeth and ignoring the dynamic spirit that giveth life." This implies, as its intellectual corollary, the capacity for initiative and independent thinking in order to face new situations with confidence and try new experiments with courage. The charge is often levelled against Religion by unbelievers that it is static and repressive and inhibits change. Of Islam, at least, it can certainly be said that it welcomes and encourages change and wants individuals as well as communities to remain alert and responsive to all the pulsating currents of the age. Now the great role which Iqbal assigns to Islamic education is to make these ideals and values universal, for potential universality is a common characteristic of all the creative ideas that Islam has contributed to the betterment of man. The Muslim should not hide his light under a bushel or use it for his own limited purposes ; he must share it with others, for real possession comes only through sharing.

In conclusion, I shall try to give you a synthetic picture of this education, the main features of which have been indicated already by implication. Firstly, it must be a dynamic and creative education, inspired by optimistic faith in the destiny of man and dedicated to the release of all his creative impulses so that he may conquer ever new realms of knowledge and power. Science and the inculcation of the scientific method will occupy a prominent place in it, for it

is the only method of conquering Nature. But the dynamism of science will be balanced by the sense of perspective and continuity which is the fruit of historical study. If a community forgets its history, says Iqbal, it may lapse into non-existence! Again, it will not postulate any false and mischievous antithesis between Science and Religion. The religious view of Reality, according to Iqbal, is a necessary complement to the scientific view, and not opposed to it. It is Faith and not Science by itself which is the source of idealism in man and provides proper direction for his activity. For, as Iqbal points out, "Truth, revealed through pure reason, is incapable of bringing that fire of living conviction which personal revelation can alone bring. That is why pure thought has so little influenced men, while religion has always elevated individuals and transformed whole societies." And he goes on to add: "Religion, which in its higher manifestations is neither dogma nor priesthood nor ritual, can alone prepare modern man for the burden of the great responsibility which the advancement of modern science necessarily involves, and restore to him that attitude of faith which makes him capable of winning a personality here and retaining it hereafter." It is, therefore, necessary that our education should be thoroughly imbued with the religious spirit, provided religion is not interpreted narrowly as a priest-ridden ritual but dynamically, as living nobly and adventurously, with all the resources of one's body and spirit, in the name of the Lord. What a transformation would such a conception of religious education make in the schools of the world!

Again, this education must be an active education and the acquisition of knowledge must be related to intelligently planned activities. As we have seen, it is only in the soil of strenuous activity that individuality can grow. Knowledge

divorced from action often provides nothing better than an escape from reality; it does not give us the power of re-shaping it. The great ethical and psychological importance of action lies in the fact that while "a wrong concept misleads the understanding, a wrong deed degrades the man and may eventually abolish the structure of the human ego." Thus we return to the conception of man as an active agent, a doer, a shaper of purposes who is not only engaged in the reconstruction of his world but is also concerned with the far more significant experiment of the creative unfolding and perfecting of his individuality:

"Art thou a particle of dust?"

Tighten the knot of thy ego,

And hold fast to thy tiny being!

How glorious to burnish one's ego

And to test its lustre in the presence of the sun!

Re-chisel then thy ancient frame,

And build up a new, well tested being.

Such being is real being

Or else thy ego is a mere ring of smoke!"

Hence this education inevitably favours the adoption of what are known as active and creative methods which stimulate self-activity and intellectual initiative. But Iqbal, with the vision of a great thinker, is never betrayed into a partial or one-sided view of any problem. Just as he rejects "over-intellectualism" and recognizes the place of action and emotion in life, so is he careful not to identify himself with that worship of pointless, trivial and feverish activity which we find in some countries of the West and which ignores tranquillity, emotional poise and quiet meditation as important values in life. In his lectures, he makes a thoughtful distinction between the "efficient" and the "affective" self which is of great significance for education.

It is the "efficient" self of man that enters into relation with the world of space and time and is occupied with the external aspect of things. It finds satisfaction in overt activity, in the re-ordering of its environment and is responsible for all our material achievements. But its activities, if unchecked, have a way of thrusting the "affective" self into the background, which is a great loss. For, it is "in moments of profound meditation when the efficient self is in abeyance that we sink into our deeper self and reach the inner centre of experience." Thus, in the education which Iqbal's philosophy envisages, there is room not only for Action but for Prayer, which is a means of spiritual illumination, and for that quiet communion with Nature and with Self which is a necessary preliminary to communion with God. It is in such moments, when overt action has ceased and we let the mysterious influences of the world of Art and Nature play upon us that our affective self, with its wealth of intuition and emotions, finds true self-expression and our personality gains that inner poise and repose, which is a source of un-failing satisfaction and joy and does not depend on external stimuli or the titillation of the senses.

And, finally, this education must be inspired by the most liberal and broad-minded spirit, strengthening the sense of human kinship and solidarity and breaking down the psychological barriers of national, racial, geographical and class loyalties which divide man from man. Man is, after all, the great common denominator and he should be the true object of our solicitude—not the American or the British or the Chinese or the Indian, nor the Christian or the Jew or the Hindu or the Muslim as such. It is this truth which all great religions have recognized and which Iqbal has so forcefully affirmed as the fundamental basis of Islamic thought and education. For he has "an imperative

vision of the divine in man" and, unlike Nietzsche, he is anxious to utilize education for "developing the divine even in a plebeian and thus open up before him an infinite future." Can education have a higher, or dare it remain content with a lower, ideal than this—of discovering God in man and building up a world worthy of his habitation?

IV. TEACHING OF HISTORY FOR THE PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONALISM AND PEACE

There are some purists amongst teachers who look askance at any proposal to organize the teaching of a subject with a specific predetermined aim. These advocates of "education for the sake of education" are of the opinion that education should be entirely free of all kinds of bias, that the teacher should make himself transparent, as it were, so that all knowledge and instruction may be transmitted through him uncoloured by his own views or temperament. I have never been able to appreciate the logic or reasonableness of this view. It rests on the grave misapprehension that it is possible and desirable to educate young minds without putting on them the impress of any particular values and ideas. My contention is that in literary and social studies at least, it is neither possible nor desirable to assume an attitude of neutrality towards human and social problems and that it is definitely the business of the teacher to know where he stands with reference to the major issues which are agitating the mind of the age. The actual position in this respect, in practically all countries, is very anomalous. If a teacher, consciously or unconsciously, defends and upholds the *status quo*, he is regarded as being impartial and objective; if he has the mental ability and alertness to question it in any way or to disagree with some of its basic assumptions and to allow his personal opinions to influence his teaching, he is accused of "indoctrination". Thus, in a dictatorship, advocacy of democracy is a crime but extolling the totalitarian system is a civic virtue. Similarly, in an imperialist State one may well teach little children the "blessings" of the Empire *ad nauseam*, without

provoking any hostile comment, but any reference to freedom or the sovereign right of all nations to independence and equality is sure to incur official displeasure, if not a prosecution for sedition. This is really a restatement of the old truth that the State has always sought to use education as a convenient means of propagating its own views, prejudices, assumptions and outlook. Unless we can establish the right of education to be a free process of releasing the human mind from the bondage of prejudice and untruth, whether in the service of the State or the Church, we cannot expect it to play its part worthily in the shaping of human destiny towards a better future.

What bearing has this general statement on the teaching of history? It is obvious that the teaching of history can exercise a greater influence on the minds of the students than any other subject. It is through the medium of history that they catch a panoramic view of the past and the tortuous course of its development, and through it they are enabled to understand something of the complex structure of modern society. Therefore, it depends on the teacher of history whether the young students get a balanced or a distorted view of social evolution. Let me pose a few questions to make my meaning clear. Is history a record of wars and dynastic squabbles and large-scale crimes or is it a study of the gradual evolution of arts and industries and other evidences of human skill and efficiency? Does it envisage patriotism as a cloak that covers a multitude of sins or is patriotism to be judged in the larger framework of human relationships? Should it seek to extol all that has been done in this or that particular country, irrespective of the reaction of these activities on other peoples and other lands, or should it apply moral and social criteria in judging the worth of men and their deeds? Too often in the past

has history been used as an instrument of propaganda for achieving generally unworthy ends, and the great technical advances made by science—particularly in the direction of communicating ideas and information—have given it a fatal efficiency. Schools and Colleges, the Cinema, the Radio, the Press and the Platform have all been pressed into service in order to give a predetermined bias to men's ideas and emotions. But, generally speaking, as the particular bias was that favoured by the Powers-that-be, it passed unchallenged and sometimes unobtrusively, often in a spectacular manner, it profoundly affected the psychology of the masses. The instances of Russia, Germany and Italy are only too recent and emphatic but by no means novel; the history of most other countries affords parallels for the same sort of process but spread over a longer period of time. We cannot, therefore, possibly get away from the fact that history is a study which must profoundly affect and influence the opinions and attitude of students— unless, of course, it is taught so badly as to leave no impress at all on the mind!

What is the position in India in this respect? If we study the cycles through which history teaching has passed in this country since the establishment of the present system of English education in India, we shall find certain well-marked tendencies. In the very early stages there was hardly any teaching of history as such. But soon it was realized by the new rulers that it was not sufficient for them to conquer the land; they must also conquer the minds of the people living in the land. So we find a number of books written by Englishmen and even by Indians in which the Hindu and Muslim periods are treated with condescension or scorn while the "Blessings of British Rule" find a prominent place. This stage, though not quite

over as yet, gave place by a process of natural reaction to another in which an attempt was made to praise the glories and achievements of the past and throw them into bolder relief. More recently, as a result of the communal and other differences, there are indications of yet another development which aims at rewriting history so as to extol special communities or provinces or groups. Now all these and other movements have had their reaction on the education of children. Those who were at school during the first stage, developed an ill-informed contempt for their past and regarded the modern British period of Indian history as the only ray of light in an otherwise unrelieved darkness. Later, there was a tendency to whitewash unpleasant historical facts and to sentimentalize the past. In recent times, we can notice the rise of special schools of historians who, consciously or unconsciously, tend to deepen differences and disagreements, instead of building a bridge of understanding across them. Can we accept any of these tendencies as valid and reasonable or is it necessary to reorient our history teaching towards a higher and nobler objective?

My plea is that neither Imperialism nor Patriotism, nor Communalism, nor Provincialism provide a beacon light for the teaching of history. They are either intrinsically unsound or they may have been good at one time but have now outlived their utility as sign-posts. In this age of science and technology, when distance has been annihilated and the interests of all nations are intertwined inextricably, no nation dare live unto itself alone. It is not the part of wisdom or morality or even of enlightened self-interest, to try and achieve a position of national isolation. In the first place it is not possible; the ship and the aeroplane, the telegraph and the telephone, the radio and the cinema, the rocket and the V-bombs would not allow it. And even if it

were possible, it would not be at all desirable. This point need hardly be argued at length at a time when the world has not quite emerged from the blood bath into which its selfishness and sectionalism and dreams of aggression and exploitation had plunged it. We must either pull together or, in literal truth, perish. No half-way house would in future be possible. So far, as I have pointed out already, the teaching of history all over the world has been narrowly nationalistic in its outlook and the slogan of "my country, right or wrong" has been its inspiration—without realizing that there is no loyalty greater than the loyalty to truth and justice and that when any lesser loyalty takes its place the course is set for ultimate destruction. A few clear-sighted thinkers like Tagore and Iqbal and Russell and Wells have raised their voices in protest against this suicidal policy but power, including the control of education, has generally been in the hands of the jingoists, both vocal and non-vocal, and the minds of the children have been poisoned by a perverted approach to human history. If we are to ensure peace, freedom and justice for the world in future, many social, political and economic measures and policies will have to be intelligently devised to meet the complexities of the existing situation. But the most important of all would be the re-education of peoples' ideas and emotions, the quiet and persistent working of a revolution in the minds of the children and the youth of the nation. In this process education, as a whole, and the teaching of history, in particular, can play a decisive part.

Let us now come to grips with the details of the problem. To achieve the end in view, we must revise and rewrite our history books with two definite objects. Firstly, school history should clearly stress the social and cultural aspects of the Story of Man and keep the military and even

the political aspects in the background. This is necessary not only because these aspects are intrinsically more important but also because in them we can study more carefully the co-operative striving of man towards a better and fuller life. Whether we take up the story of inventions and discoveries, or the development of arts and crafts, or the growth of science and literature, or any other department of creative activity, we shall find that no racial, national or geographical frontiers de-limit them; they are the common heritage of all mankind and the fruit of the labours of countless known and unknown workers belonging to all countries and ages. The Jew and the Gentile, the Muslim and the Hindu, the Theist and the Atheist have all contributed to their development. If through the study of social and cultural history this truth is brought home to children in a concrete manner, it should provide a welcome corrective to national prejudices and narrow-mindedness.

Secondly, our entire school teaching, including history teaching, should take note of the great changes in international relationships which the development of the scientific technique and more especially the rapid means of communication have brought about. While a hundred or even fifty years ago, nations could live unto themselves, it is a sheer impossibility today to do so. Wars, famines, epidemics and economic crashes have tragically underlined this truth and it is high time that education also awoke to its realization. We shall have to reorient all our teaching in such a way that students may feel the throbbing reality and the vital necessity of this international interdependence. It is only then that the citizens of tomorrow will be able to understand and evaluate proposals and policies with due regard to this important and inescapable fact. It will require a revaluation of historical material from this point of view and the

inclusion of living and significant subject matter to illustrate this new complexion of the modern world. There can be no justification for sending out students from our High Schools and Colleges who know all about "old, unhappy, far-off things" but have no idea of the principal forces shaping and modifying the world around them. If this is to be done we shall have to throw overboard a good deal of the useless lumber which clutters the history books and syllabus today and has at best only a sentimental value and find room for the study of world history in our schools. I feel that we confine ourselves far too much today to the history of India—with English history as the only adventure abroad—and keep our school children in ignorance of the stories of other nations and peoples. National prejudices are often born of ignorance and one of the most effective ways of resolving them is to present their history to children with imaginative sympathy so that they begin to feel quite naturally that different people have worked out their destiny in different ways and that there is no single political or other system which is perfect and sacrosanct while all others are inferior and objectionable. It would be wrong to imagine that school children are too young and immature to understand and feel interested in world history; it is really a matter of proper selection and presentation. I have seen quite young children hanging on the teacher's lips even in lessons dealing with pre-history!

The problem of peace is obviously linked up with that of internationalism. If the human family is one and indivisible and their weal and woe cannot be separated, peace is the essential condition of human survival. But with children, mere intellectual apprehension is not enough; they must also feel things emotionally. A good teacher should be able to think out many practical ways of making the

children "peace-minded" and he should devote at least as much ingenuity and thought to this as is done today to make them war-minded. There is no reason why the "heroes of peace" should not be honoured in schools far more than the makers of wars, why special days should not be set aside to celebrate the memory of great men and women of other lands, why steps should not be taken to bring vividly to the notice of children as well as adults the incredible horrors associated with the total warfare of the modern age. This war has abolished the time-honoured division between the front line and civilian life and if people could clearly visualize—not only during the actual days of fighting but as a part of their unconscious mental make-up—all that war brings and is apt to bring in its train—death and destruction, starvation and misery, interference with personal freedom and creative work—they will not fall such easy victims to militaristic propaganda. If education is to be a dynamic activity, it will have to address itself resolutely to such issues and not fight shy of them as it has done so far. It will have to shift the emphasis from an advocacy of unfettered national sovereignty to that of the reign of law amongst nations. It will have to acknowledge and underline the fact that war is inevitable till the causes that bring it about—economic exploitation, political domination, lack of security and all other forces which militate against justice and fairplay between nations—have been removed. With the proper selection and presentation of subject-matter, illumined by the teacher's own living faith in the ideals of peace and justice, the cultivation of this mentality should not be very difficult. Particularly so in India which has an ancient and abiding tradition of peace, where in spite of their own political preoccupations and difficulties people always and instinctively sympathize with oppressed nations

and condemn the aggressors, and where peace is still venerated as a great ideal. If India as well as other countries will not take a warning from the bitter experience of the past and beware of the dark menace looming on the horizon, mankind will indeed be doomed, for it cannot survive the total war of the future. If another world war does come, all that man has achieved through the travail of centuries will be reduced to dust and ashes !

V. EDUCATION IN INDIA

I am afraid I cannot promise to give you, in the course of this lecture, anything very exciting or educationally significant, because the history of Indian Education is a depressing rather than an exhilarating story. So far as the percentage of literacy or other obvious appurtenances of an organized system of education are concerned, India must be reckoned as one of the most backward of civilized countries where education, particularly that of the masses, has to make up a tremendous lee-way. The situation offers a challenge to the conscience of the country and is the despair of the educationist. This may possibly strike you as strange and inexplicable, because India has really been a land of learning throughout the ages—not in the sense that education has been either universal or widespread but in the sense that learning and scholarship have always been highly valued and the learned man has been held in higher esteem than the warrior or the administrator. In the Hindu social hierarchy, the Brahmin or the priest who instructs takes precedence over the Kshatriya who governs and wages war; and in the words of the Prophet of Islam, the ink of the scholar is even more precious than the blood of the martyr! In ancient and medieval India the close association between educational work and the priestly classes gave education a religious rather than a secular significance. So, something of the sanctity that attached to religion passed on to education also; it was never regarded merely as a means for facilitating the earning of a livelihood. It was in many ways limited in its scope but it was a more integral part of contemporary culture than education is today. Teachers took it up as a labour of love and students pursued it with zeal and industry with the object of

acquiring culture and scholarship and spiritual enrichment.

Why is it, then, that in the mid-twentieth century, when the rest of the world has made such big strides towards popularization of education, India should be found lagging so far behind? It is a long, complicated sequence of causes and circumstances into the details of which it is not necessary for me to enter. But a few facts of general significance may perhaps be of interest to you. In the age of the Great Moghuls, which preceded the rule of the East India Company, there was in India a fairly widespread educational system—not universal by any means but open to all who might care to avail themselves of it—maintained by private philanthropy and patronized by the State. When the Moghul Empire broke up, a period of chaos and confusion followed, covering well-nigh the whole of the eighteenth century, during which many old social and cultural modes and institutions broke down and the continuity of educational work was seriously disrupted. During this period, a large number of educational institutions closed down and literacy touched its lowest ebb. The East India Company, which had gradually gained control over the greater part of the country, did not care for education, did not even realize that the provision of adequate educational opportunity is a necessary function of every Government that claims to be civilized. Barring the work done by Christian Missionaries in the field of education—which was done with mixed motives—India was plunged into a period of educational darkness so far as popular secular education was concerned. As late as 1813, the Company sanctioned in its budget the magnificent sum of about £ 7,000 for the education of the entire country over which it held sway! For the next forty years, education was given a miserable dole which could not possibly reduce the incidence of illiteracy. Since then,

of course, much more has been spent on education, comparatively speaking, but the problem is so immense in its magnitude that nothing less than a radical, nation-wide programme, mobilizing all material and human resources, can either be effective or adequate. This, however, was never attempted, quantitatively as well as qualitatively; the education provided was meagre, inadequate and unworthy. Perhaps a few salient features of the Indian situation will give you some idea of the frightful gap between what is and what should be, between the goal in view and the efforts made to reach it.

India is a country with a population of 400 million human beings, i.e. sixty times the population of Australia and one-fifth of the entire human race. There are in it roughly 60 million children of school-going age of whom as many as 45 million do not enter schools at all—either because there are no schools or because the parents cannot afford it or the education imparted is so out of touch with life, so divorced from the activities and occupations of the countryside, that the masses show no appreciation for it and do not avail themselves fully even of the meagre facilities available. As education is neither free nor compulsory and the schooling, is not sufficiently attractive, half the children who enter school do not stay longer than a year which means that they cannot possibly acquire the barest rudiments of literacy, and consequently there is a tremendous wastage of effort. Perhaps only about four million children stay long enough at school to acquire proper literacy but even they cannot acquire any useful social or civic training during this short period. Effective education is, therefore, practically confined to those who can afford to receive secondary or higher education, and they are a very small percentage of the total population. Under the circumstances, it is only natural

that the range of education should be limited and its standard low. While other countries, impelled by the logic of the dynamic forces operating in their national life, have gone ahead under the leadership of their national Governments and built up fine educational systems, India has been handicapped not only by the presence of a foreign Government largely indifferent to the development of essential social services, but also by a lack of initiative, of persistence and of a dynamic outlook in the people, which is a natural consequence of political subjection. Apportion the responsibility between the people and the Government as you like, the fact remains that neither vision nor courage nor foresight has characterized Indian educational policy during the last 150 years and we are today reaping the fruits of this long indifference and timidity of outlook. On the qualitative side, the picture is not much more satisfactory. There are many factors, material and psychological, which determine the standard and quality of education in schools—the teachers, the curriculum, methods of teaching, buildings, equipment, playgrounds, and all the physical, social, moral and aesthetic influences at work in the child's environment. It is the total impact of all these that moulds the child's many-sided personality. Now, in India, a variety of factors, amongst which financial stringency is probably the most important, have contributed to make even the material provision for education shabby and unworthy of the great enterprise. It is difficult for outsiders with their well-planned school buildings to imagine the conditions under which our children are being brought up during the most formative years of their life. In the villages in particular, a large majority of schools are housed in mud huts, consisting of one or two or three small rooms, with bare walls and dusty floors and hardly any furniture, with no facilities for

washing or midday meals or rest, with no children's books or pictures or charts or appliances and no properly designed protection against the rigours of the climate. It is in such a bleak and unattractive environment that the poor teacher is expected to "educate" the children, which means, literally, to "draw out" all their potentialities, physical, intellectual, artistic and moral. How can any child be expected to develop a normal, healthy and enriched personality under these conditions? Add to this the fact that the primary school teachers, who are the backbone of any educational system, are paid pitifully low salaries, averaging about £ 2 a month—that the educational expenditure per child is about 12 shillings a year in India, as against an average of about £ 40 in Great Britain—and that, incredible as it sounds, the total educational expenditure from public funds in India is approximately equal to the educational expenditure of all kinds in Greater London! If you take all these sobering facts into consideration, you will have a fairly correct synthetic picture of the Indian educational situation. With such a lack of good personnel and paucity of financial resources, the wonder is not that India should be largely illiterate and educationally backward, but that in spite of these handicaps it should have produced men of the intellectual stature of Tagore and Iqbal, and scientists, philosophers, artists, poets, men of letters, administrators and statesmen able to hold their own against the best in the world! It is a tribute, if I may say so, not to the educational system but to the Indian genius which has been able in so many cases to triumph against the heaviest odds.

I may also perhaps add that I am not confusing literacy either with education or with culture and I know how, in the countryside, amongst people who are utterly illiterate, there are millions of persons who have the capacity for hard

and honest work, who are fair and decent in their dealings with their fellows, who have the innate kindness, the strength of character, the self-respect and the grace which are the finest fruit of good education and culture. They have acquired these qualities in the exacting school of life. But in the world of today literacy and academic education have acquired a special significance and they cannot be set aside as unimportant in life. And, in any case, there is obviously a greater chance of people spending their life in mental darkness and obscurantism if they are denied educational opportunities than if they have them. In the new social order that has already emerged in many countries, albeit imperfectly, and is gradually beginning to take shape in India also, we cannot, and shall not, remain content either with natural qualities of character or with the fact that the finest thinkers and statesmen and scientists that we have been able to produce are as good as any in the world: the real worth of a civilization and a social order is to be measured not by these extraordinary men and women of genius and calibre but by the standard of intelligence, personality and moral and social worth achieved by the general mass of the people. For such stray manifestations of greatness are no indication that the health of the social organism is satisfactory. If a few individuals or small groups enjoy the amenities of culture and material comfort, while the majority of the people are steeped in ignorance and disease and poverty and have no opportunity of appreciating and enjoying the riches of the mind and the spirit, such a state of affairs is not only unfair socially and morally but it also harbours the seeds of its decay within its own bosom. Social justice, as well as enlightened self-interest, therefore demands that we should organize our social and educational system in such a way that the general standard

of living and thought and culture may be raised and talent is exploited wherever it exists so that it may enrich the social organism in due course. We should not be content merely with the establishment of a system of education which brings schooling within the reach of every child but should also strive to enrich the mental fare provided for the children of the masses in the ordinary public elementary schools. There has been unfortunately a general tendency to believe that a narrow curriculum, centring on the three R's and divorced from the rich pulsating currents of life, is good enough for these children and wider cultural amenities may well be dispensed with in their case as useless or unnecessary frills—e. g. arts and crafts, poetry and music, pictures and plays, games and sports and social training. We have to break down this class-dominated conception of education and strive earnestly to establish equality of opportunity in the educational field for all boys and girls, irrespective of their social and economic status.

I started with giving you some idea of the existing educational situation in India, mainly with reference to primary education, because that is our biggest problem and our greatest headache. I have not referred to secondary and higher education because, although, comparatively speaking, they are not so badly neglected, their scope is very limited and they affect the lives and careers of a comparatively small fraction of the people. Moreover, they are also dominated, on the whole, by the same theoretical, unrealistic and bookish bias that we find in the field of primary education. I have, however, indicated in passing the new outlook in education which is beginning to affect our work at present, directing us to enlarge the scope and enrich the content of education, and throw its doors open to all who have the capacity and the talent to profit by it. I shall now

proceed to refer briefly to a few significant educational experiments which have been carried out in recent years with the object of improving the quality and standard of education and which may be interpreted as signs of hope on the educational horizon.

Many of you have, no doubt, heard of India's great poet, writer, artist and cultural ambassador, Rabindranath Tagore, and the institution which he founded at Bolpur, with the name of Santiniketan, which means "the Abode of Peace". This institution represents a reaction, if not a revulsion, against the narrow, prosaic, secular and soulless education which the State provides for children in its schools. It is cut off from the springs of the people's life and culture and is merely a means of training clerks and junior administrative officers for Government service. Tagore, who was not only a literary genius but also embodied in his own person all the manifold values of culture, felt that such a narrow curriculum deriving its content as well as its inspiration from foreign sources and relying on the medium of a foreign language, could not possibly provide the right type of social, moral and aesthetic education. Moreover, it was much too formal and stereotyped and hide-bound, and rigidly governed by rules and regulations and red tape. He, therefore, established a new institution, not bound by the curricula or the regulations of the Government Education Department, where education was to be imparted in an atmosphere of freedom, where children were to be nourished not on a poor re-hash of what foreign writers had said or written but on the rich resources of Indian art and literature, of Indian life and ways. Thus Tagore brought about a *rapprochement* between education and folk culture, and was perhaps the first Indian educationist in modern times to try and exploit fully the educational resources of art, which

Indian schools had tended to ignore altogether. Students are given opportunities for social work and community service in the villages, education thus losing somewhat its unrealistic and theoretical complexion. While its genius is essentially Indian, its outlook is modern and international and this has been greatly facilitated by the fact that Tagore's personal attraction drew several distinguished scholars from Asia, Europe and America to come and spend their time at Santiniketan which thus acquired something of the status of an International University. The Santiniketan experiment is important because it gave a new confidence to Indian educationists; they realized, after many decades, that they should not remain content merely with "taking" but that they had also something valuable to "give" to the world.

Another significant educational experiment is represented by the National Muslim University of Delhi, popularly known as the Jamia, which is celebrating its Silver Jubilee in November 1946. This institution is also the result of private enterprise. It has consistently refused to accept Government grant-in-aid or recognition, and because of its radical and nationalistic character was until recently looked upon with suspicion by Government. All other Universities in India have received their charter from Government and regularly receive grants from it. In return, Government has the right to guide and supervise their work and to interfere in their affairs. The Jamia is free from any such interference. It has tried to evolve a new ideology and to educate youngmen who will not hanker after Government services but devote themselves to public work and social service or enter into business and other independent professions. Released from the repressive influence of an all-pervasive external dominance and mistress in her own household, the Jamia has been able to work out its own

methods and curricula and to place its distinctive stamp on its alumni. It has, in the first place, adopted Urdu or Hindustani, which is the *lingua franca* of the country, as its medium of instruction. Considering that in all other Universities except the Osmania University of Hyderabad English has been the only medium of teaching in College classes, this marks a radical, almost a revolutionary change. You who have never had the terrible handicap of learning everything through a foreign language, of being denied access to the treasures of arts and sciences and the whole world of thought without acquiring mastery over a language radically different from your mother tongue, can have no idea of what loss of creative talent and capacity, what arrest of self-expression follows from this linguistic atrocity. The Jamia took up the position that the creative capacity of a people cannot be released unless its children and its youth are educated through the language that is woven into the very fabric of their being because they drink it, as it were, with their mother's milk. In the second place, it has taken the lead in initiating the "Activity Movement" in education and the Primary and Secondary Schools attached to it have won all-India recognition and also received praise from distinguished foreign educationists. Again, it has tried to inculcate through its teaching, its extra-curricular activities, its general social life and atmosphere and, above all, through the personal example of the fine set of people on its staff, a broadly national as well as humanistic outlook in its students. It is primarily a Muslim institution—though admission and staff appointments are open to all communities—and its great ambition is to form a bridge and a link between the best elements of Hindu and Muslim culture, to make the Hindus appreciate the great value of Muslim ideology and to persuade the Muslims to play their part worthily in the

land of their birth. The preaching of this gospel of broad-minded toleration, of cultural fusion and *rapprochement*, of recognizing differences but interpreting them as means of enrichment rather than reasons for conflicts, of individuality nurtured in a social context, of respect for patterns of community-cultures set in the larger framework of national life—the preaching of these values has acquired a special significance in these days when separatist movements and political and cultural intolerance are gaining ground rapidly in India as well as in other countries. The success of this great educational experiment is due primarily to the personality, the vision, the idealism and the moral fervour of its head, Dr Zakir Husain, who is destined, I believe, to rank very high amongst the great contemporary educationists of the world. He has also had the singular good fortune of collecting around him a band of selfless teachers, who have worked for about twenty-five years under financial and other difficulties which would have disheartened any other group of lesser worth and calibre.

During the last few years there have been two other significant developments which hold out great promise for the future if they are carried to completion. One of them owes its inspiration to the genius and the initiative of Mahatma Gandhi and the other to a belated recognition on the part of the Government of India of the great national importance which must be attached to education. The first is the scheme of Basic National Education drawn up by the Zakir Husain Committee and the second the scheme of Post-War Educational Reconstruction in India prepared by the Central Advisory Board of Education. As these two schemes are bound to exercise a far-reaching influence on the future of education in India, I propose, with your permission, to outline their salient features briefly.

The genesis of the Basic Education Scheme dates back to 1937 when Mahatma Gandhi wrote a series of articles in his weekly paper, the *Harijan*, discussing Indian education critically and pointing out some of its outstanding defects. His main thesis was that education was out of tune with life and did not take into account the needs and problems of the masses. While life is practical and productive, the school is mainly a place of book learning. It fails, therefore, to train students for the demands of an active, social and practical life. A village boy, who has to find his livelihood and his life interests in agriculture and allied forms of manual work, does not become a better farmer or a better citizen by receiving stereotyped instruction in the three R's, which are generally divorced from the concrete realities and problems of life. Mahatma Gandhi presented the revolutionary idea—which created a flutter in the academic doves—that all primary education must be centred on some kind of craft work and every item of knowledge that is taught should be closely related to the basic craft chosen. He went to the length of suggesting that all knowledge that cannot be correlated with the basic craft and cannot be taught as arising naturally out of the craft activities should be dropped, on the presumption that if it cannot be so related it is not of fundamental importance. This and certain other ideas, important but not so novel, were first discussed by a conference of educationists and later entrusted for detailed consideration and criticism and for proper formulation to a committee of which Dr Zakir Husain was the Chairman. This Committee translated these rather general and rudimentary ideas into educational terms and submitted an important report in which the educational *raison d'être* of the scheme was fully discussed and a draft curriculum on the correlated plan was prepared. The education contemplated

by the scheme was described as Basic because it aimed at giving to all the children the basic or fundamental knowledge and skills without which no one could live efficiently or happily in the complicated world of today. It was called National because, for the first time in the modern period, it was to be given a nation-wide scope—not confined to this or that particular class or to the cities rather than the villages, or to boys rather than girls, but open to all, irrespective of caste or creed or sex or social and economic status; it was to be National also in the sense that its ideology was indigenous rather than borrowed, and it refused to adopt the cast-off clothing of English education as it used to be many decades earlier. The scheme aimed at the following objectives, modest in themselves but very far-reaching in their implications if viewed in the context of the existing educational situation.

1. Education was to be compulsory, free and universal. This is something which most other civilized countries have already achieved. But you will be surprised to learn that the battle for the introduction of compulsion in education has been going on in India since 1911, and although it has been won in theory it is still a long way from becoming an accomplished fact. In a country where only 33 per cent of the children of school-going age attend school and only 7 per cent of them actually manage to reach Class IV, the introduction of compulsory and universal education is a prerequisite for all social, economic and political reconstruction. The size of the country and its population have often been adduced by reactionaries and apologists as arguments against the possibility of providing educational facilities of such magnitude for all the people of this country. How can a poor country like India, they argue, afford either universal or free education? They do not, however, realize that the real

question is not whether India can afford to have such education but whether it can afford not to have it! There is such tremendous waste of talent due to lack of educational opportunity and such dearth of adequately trained personnel for the thousands of things that have to be done in different fields that the only hope for a better future lies in a generously conceived and adequately planned education, provided at any cost. If mass education is regarded as a superfluous luxury or at best as an act of optional philanthropy, one can think of ways and means of reducing expenditure and of restricting opportunity. But if it is a fundamental human and civic right and basic to the well-being of the community, funds and resources must be found for the purpose, and paradoxical as it may sound, the poorer a country the greater the need for large educational expenditure to exploit its natural resources and improve its productive capacity. If educational and cultural activities are considered to be as important as wars or atom-bombs, funds will have to be found even as they are somehow made available for purposes of destruction. In a potentially rich country like India the large expenditure needed for education can be found, provided a progressive and enlightened national Government adopts a many-sided programme of national planning and industrial and economic reconstruction.

2. The scheme postulates that compulsory education must be provided for a period of at least seven years from the age of seven to the age of fourteen. This may, on the face of it, strike you as too modest, if not definitely retrograde, an objective. But if you consider the fact that the present period of primary schooling does not exceed four years—which is hardly sufficient even to acquire the bare rudiments of literacy—the demand for seven years' compulsory education does really mark a step forward. No doubt,

we shall find this period inadequate as other countries have done and it will have to be extended to cover the entire period of adolescence. But before that can be done it will be necessary to ensure that every boy and girl has at least the chance of receiving seven years' schooling.

3. Education must be imparted through the mother tongue. This is such an obvious and reasonable demand that, in this twentieth century of grace, it should not be necessary to formulate it at all. But as I have already pointed out, the situation in India regarding the medium of instruction is so queer and abnormal that it is necessary to re-state even this self-evident truth in clear and unambiguous terms.

4. In order to bring education nearer to life and to redress the balance between theory and practice, it has been proposed that this education should be related to the basic interests of the child mind and the basic occupations of community life. For this purpose, it is essential that education should centre on some basic craft chosen with due regard to the occupations of the locality. This craft is not to be just another subject added to the curriculum like that old-timer "manual training"; it is to be the pivot of the entire teaching to which all other subjects are to be correlated. As the craft is practised and its "why and wherefore" studied with care, many problems will arise and many questions will press themselves on the child's attention, and in dealing with them and following their ramifications, under the tactful but unobtrusive guidance of the teacher, the child will gradually find his way into the realms of history, geography, science, etc. Thus education, starting as a unified and integral activity, will lead him into ever-widening regions of knowledge which will not need to be thrust on him but will be acquired in response to a felt need. Such an approach to the unlocking of the

child's mind and his creative capacities is more effective and fruitful than the adoption of routine methods, because it enlists the powerful support of his instincts and offers better opportunities for co-operation and group work and thus establishes a liaison between life in school and outside. It gives useful productive work the place of honour in schools and thus affords facilities not only for the training of practical aptitudes but also for an all-round social and moral education.

This, in bald outline, is the scheme of Basic Education. It made a promising beginning in 1938 and should by this time have gone a long way ahead. But the war and the political struggle in India intervened and its general adoption was postponed. During these eight years, it has passed through the most critical stages of trial and experimentation and though many modifications and adjustments of detail will be necessary in the light of growing experience and criticism, the fundamentals of the scheme and its psychological bases have been amply vindicated. I have no doubt that it will exercise a powerful formative influence on the shaping of Indian educational policy. It will not be possible hereafter for any intelligent educational administrator of the future to think of education only in terms of the needs of the upper and middle classes or to envisage the primary school as mainly a place of passive book-learning, unrelated to the existing socio-economic situation and its future as visualized by men of vision and foresight. The great merit of a creative idea, once it has taken root in people's minds, lies in the fact that it shows up the inadequacies of practices and theories which are hide-bound in a dead routine.

The second significant sign on the educational horizon is the post-war scheme of educational development which

is popularly known as the Sargent Scheme—after Sir John Sargent, the Educational Adviser to the Government of India, who was largely responsible for piloting it through the irksome stages of Committees and Conferences. For the first time in the history of British India, an official attempt was made to face the issue squarely: Should education go along in the slow, slipshod and haphazard manner as it had been doing for the last 150 years (on the assumption that India could never accomplish in the field of education what most other civilized countries had already achieved) or should an honest and sincere attempt be made to place this country on the educational map of the world by providing educational facilities on the same scale as in many other countries of the East and the West? The great merit of this scheme lies in the fact that it is the only comprehensive attempt so far made to survey the problem of Indian Education as a whole from the nursery school to the university and to work out its financial and administrative implications. Moreover, it offers a definite challenge to the conscience of all those who have the true welfare of India at heart. India must either provide the minimum educational facilities outlined in this scheme or she must be prepared to accept a position of educational inferiority for an indefinite length of time. So far, Government and educational administrators had been merely tinkering with the problem of educational reform—opening a few more schools and colleges, adding certain subjects to or taking others away from the curriculum—and whenever any comprehensive, large-scale measures like the introduction of universal, free and compulsory education were suggested, they blessed them in principle but took refuge behind the fact that their adoption was beyond the range of “practical politics”! The Sargent Scheme reverses this policy and

affirms that the only "practical politics" is to implement the various proposals made for the expansion and development of education from the nursery school to the university and the technological institute. The scope of this gigantic undertaking may perhaps become clear to you from the following facts and figures which form the basis of the recommendations made in the scheme. It is proposed to provide

- (a) Pre-primary Education on a voluntary basis for about one million children, in the first instance, between the ages of 3 and 6;
- (b) Universal, free and compulsory Basic Education for nearly 36 million children between the ages of 6 and 14;
- (c) A suitable system of High School Education, imparted in Academic as well as Technical High Schools for over 7 million students;
- (d) University Education for about 240,000 students;
- (e) Technical, Commercial and Art Education for 75,000 students;
- (f) A nation-wide net-work of different kinds of Adult Education Centres to make over 90 million adults literate.

In addition, the Advisory Board has made important recommendations about the training and prospects of teachers, the education of handicapped children, the establishment of school medical services, recreational facilities of all kinds through a properly organized youth movement, the organization of Employment Bureaux and of an efficient administrative system. It is obviously a very big undertaking and the authors of the scheme recognize that the training of teachers, the construction of buildings and the provision of all other facilities will naturally take time

and they have, therefore, suggested that the entire scheme should be put into effect within a period of 40 years, which means that by the time the present century draws to its close, India will have a comprehensive system of national education. Curiously enough, this time factor has come in for criticism from two diametrically opposite angles. The timid and unimaginative hold that this vastly expanded educational system, which will increase the educational budget sixteen-fold, is beyond India's financial capacity. The radicals, who compare the present condition of the country with the progress made by the rest of the world, condemn the scheme as too slow and inadequate. It is unnecessary for me to adjudicate between these two opposing views but I do feel that we cannot possibly accept anything less than what the scheme contemplates and we shall have to find somehow the means to implement it and, if possible, to accelerate the pace. One vitally important feature of the scheme is that it represents an attempt, limited though it may be, at ensuring equality of opportunity in the field of education. While many other countries have been approximating towards this objective, India has lagged far behind and the vast majority of Indian children have no educational opportunities of any kind. But in this "century of the common man" no social, cultural or political movement deserves our support unless it aims at removing the deprivations and disabilities under which the common man has been suffering for ages—unless, in other words, it is inspired by a passion for social justice. This scheme is to be welcomed because it is a step forward on the road to the goal of social justice.

To my mind the importance of the scheme lies not so much in the magnitude of its dimensions as in the fact that it implies and, in fact, demands, a far-reaching social,

political and economic reconstruction of national life. The attempt to educate 400 million human beings, on the fruitful lines of Basic Education and its proper follow-up through the well-designed stages of Secondary, Higher and Technical education, is bound to have far-reaching repercussions not only on the Indian social economy but also on the world situation as a whole. You cannot possibly keep one-fifth of the human race, once it has been educated, in poverty, ill-health, cultural darkness and political subjection. They will demand, and obtain, their legitimate material, cultural, social and political rights. Again, technical education cannot be provided in, or for, a vacuum. It will be necessary to industrialize the country with the help of the highly-skilled technical personnel that would become available and thus there will be a marked increase in the national wealth which will enable ambitious schemes of social services being financed. Education will prove to be, as it has in other countries, a most remunerative, long-range investment, paying its dividends not only in the form of increased material wealth but also in the shape of happier, healthier, more social and enlightened men and women. Thus the educational effort that we are contemplating becomes something more than the mere liquidation of illiteracy and ignorance—it is a crusade in behalf of a better future for this great land through a well-organized, generous and soundly conceived educational plan. Here I cannot do better than quote the arresting Chinese proverb which is reproduced in the Sargent Report :

“If you are planning for one year, plant grain ;

If you are planning for ten years, plant trees ;

If you are planning for a hundred years, plant men.”

The education of a nation is obviously the process of planting men and women of the right type and this is exactly

what Indian education is setting out to do.

What chance is there, you might ask, of this scheme being implemented? It is obvious that it can only be put into effect by a strong popular and representative national Government. The bureaucratic foreign Government, which had so far held sway over the destinies of India, would not—and perhaps could not—launch such an ambitious programme, which must bring in its train, as I have already hinted, many far-reaching social and economic changes. The recent political developments in India, with which you are no doubt familiar, hold out the hope that the period of India's so-called political tutelage is over. No doubt, there will be many difficulties and trials, but from what I know of the political temper of my country, I have reason to hope that education will be given a high priority in its programme of national planning, and while the question of finances may cause worry and anxiety, it will not be allowed to arrest or torpedo the scheme of educational reconstruction. The new Government will not act on the assumption that the people of India are incapable of achieving what others have achieved. If within a period of 40 years the U.S.A. could increase the percentage of literacy in the Philippines from 2 to 55, if within 20 years the U.S.S.R. could reduce the illiteracy of its backward and widely-scattered population from 78 to 8 per cent, if China and Turkey, struggling against the heaviest of odds, could tackle this problem with notable success, is there any reason, in the nature of things, why India should be unable to do so? But obviously there are certain conditions which must be fulfilled. What is needed, in the first instance, is the transformation of this educational effort into an enthusiastic educational crusade on a nationwide basis, which would sweep away alike the people's indifference and the administration's timidity. This will

require an educational machinery which is efficient and co-ordinated, possesses initiative and freedom and is able to rise above red-tape; it will require an army of men and women who are not only well qualified and trained but also inspired by an ideology of service and an understanding of the larger issues of their work; it will require men of imagination, who can plan on a large scale and translate ideals and visions into concrete realities, and, above all, it will need in all workers, from the highest to the lowest, something of that generous enthusiasm for humanity which transforms patient drudgery for a good cause into an instrument of joyous self-expression and sets even the meanest work aglow with the sacred fire. In the measure that we in India can provide such an organization and such workers, our success will be ensured.

I have presumed on your patience and your courtesy to give you this account of education in India—what is and what might be, its present inadequacies and its future ideals, its hopes and its fears. I have done so in order to ask for your sympathy and goodwill in the struggle that we have been waging—and propose to wage with greater vigour hereafter—against ignorance and illiteracy. In this “one world” which is so closely knit together, no country or people can afford to remain indifferent to what happens in other parts of the world; for not only Peace and Freedom but also Culture and Education are indivisible. You cannot have a sane and rational and enlightened world where only half the people are educated and able to enter into “the kingdom of the mind” while the other half are condemned to ignorance and illiteracy and thus deprived of the riches of the spirit which is their birthright. So what happens in the great countries of India and China or in the remote regions of Africa does concern you intimately—not in any aloof,

condescending, academic sense but in a real sense—because we are members one of another and our weal and woe are inextricably intertwined. We must, literally, either stand together or perish.

May I, therefore, carry with me from the people of Australia and its educationists, who are trying to build up for themselves a fine educational structure, a message of sympathy, goodwill and encouragement to my people in their crusade for the educational uplift of one-fifth of the entire human race?

PART TWO
THE UNESCO

I. INTRODUCTORY

It is necessary that people in India, who are concerned with educational and cultural or political activities, should take an alert and intelligent interest in a new and significant organ which has been set up under the auspices of the United Nations Organization, i.e. the United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (UNESCO). We in India have always been interested in the problem of peace, both ethically and politically; and while our history has no doubt been marred by many wars and conflicts, we have never—even at our worst—indulged in large-scale carnage and bloodshed to the same extent as many other peoples and countries claiming to be highly civilized. The religious and philosophical thought of Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism (as of other religions) has always stressed the values of peace. It is, therefore, but natural that we should feel interested in any new and promising effort that may be made with the object of furthering these values. Since the UNESCO is such an attempt and its primary objective is “to strengthen the defences of peace” in the hearts and minds of the peoples of the world, all men and women of goodwill should wish it well and maintain towards it an attitude of vigilant sympathy and helpful criticism. I am writing this in the hope that it may serve to awaken the interest, at least, of educated circles in the success of this new experiment.

The genesis of the UNESCO is traceable to a somewhat accidental war-time association amongst the Allied Ministers of Education from occupied countries in Europe who happened to be in London in 1940 and who came together with the object of considering the educational problems which their countries would have to face after the war in rebuilding their shattered educational and cultural

fabric. The Nazi regime in these countries had brought to them a cultural devastation even more damaging in its long-range consequences than the physical devastation from which they had all suffered in such terrible measure. They set up Committees and Commissions to study the different problems involved—ranging from a survey of the quantitative destruction of books, laboratory equipment, museums, etc. to the question of the revision of history text-books with the object of eliminating biased and undesirable material—and hopefully drew up plans for educational reconstruction after liberation. The idea, however, gradually grew and expanded and it was felt that in order to make education an effective and forceful ally in behalf of peace, it would be desirable to set up a world-wide organization of all educational and cultural workers with the object of securing the fullest and freest intellectual co-operation amongst them and providing them with a platform from which thinkers, teachers, artists, philosophers, scientists and all men and women doing creative work may have the chance to speak, on behalf of the collective conscience of humanity, in favour of peace and justice. This idea was blessed at the San Francisco Conference because the statesmen assembled there realized at last the rather obvious truth that peace and international understanding could not be built up only on the basis of political and economic treaties and plans. The prevention of war and the establishment of peace is as much a psychological problem as a political problem and it is, therefore, necessary to provide an educational, cultural and psychological background for the political and economic organizations that were being set up to ensure political and economic security. In November 1945 a Conference was convened in London with the object of drawing up a constitution for the proposed educational organization which

was to be named the UNESCO. Delegates from over forty countries, including India, attended it and took part in its deliberations. The constitution provides that each member State is entitled to send to the Conference a delegation consisting of not more than five persons selected by the Government in consultation with a National Cultural Commission representative of all educational and cultural interests in the country. The organization is to take up two duties simultaneously—the immediate task of cultural rehabilitation in the devastated countries of Europe and the long-range task of facilitating and developing cultural intercourse on an international scale and using all the modern resources of educational, cultural, scientific and other propaganda agencies to promote international understanding and peace. Its Conferences are to meet annually in different countries of the world and the collective wisdom of mankind—as represented not by its politicians but by its creative and cultural workers—is to be brought to bear on the many complicated problems of educational advancement and re-orientation that may come up for discussion.

The constitution of the UNESCO has since been ratified by most of the States participating in the Conference and it has also entered into a treaty with the UNO, the parent organization, whereby it becomes one of its specialized organs for helping in the preservation of peace and fighting on the psychological front against the tendencies making for war. Its first Conference is to be held in November 1946 in Paris when it will discuss the nature of the problems which it can and should tackle, decide which of them should be given priority and take practical steps to implement its policies and decisions.

This is very roughly and sketchily the set-up of the UNESCO. Its success will, in my opinion, depend on a

number of factors. Firstly, on its courage and its capacity to become a really world-wide organization, including within it not only the Allied Nations but also the neutral as well as the ex-enemy countries which need even a stiffer dose of cultural liberalism and peace-mindedness than others. It is obviously essential that the victorious nations should not be content with "imposing" peace on the vanquished nations, but through the UNESCO they should be afforded an opportunity to co-operate actively in the "de-nazification" of the ideology of their own people. Likewise, if Russia remains out, either of her own free will—as is unfortunately the case at present—or because she is distrustful of UNESCO intentions and policies, it will be bad for Russia as well as for the rest of the world. The UNESCO should, therefore, start as far as possible with a clean slate and eschew the distrust, suspicion and mental reservations which unfortunately characterize the working of other international organizations. This is no easy task, for distrust is contagious and wide-spread in the world today. There is, however, some measure of hope in the fact that the UNESCO is not an association of politicians who are generally addicted to taking national and sectional views on all problems, but of men and women engaged in cultural activities, which are by nature co-operative, and they may be expected to take a more rational and humane view of the world problems and the world situation. Secondly, it is necessary that on the crucial issues that face the world today, like the use of the Atom Bomb or the place of "patriotism" in education or racial relations, it should speak with a decisive and unambiguous voice and not in the mealy-mouthed phrases which are used to conceal lack of clarity or untenable compromises. Intellectuals have, in the past, often played to the tune of

war-mongers and fallen victims to mass hysteria at times of crises—what happened in Germany is only an extreme example of a weakness found in all countries. It is up to them now to lead, and not to follow, the administrators and politicians in the formulation of national policies, particularly in so far as they bear on problems of international understanding in the field of culture and politics. The UNESCO should become a natural forum for giving such a lead.

Thirdly, the UNESCO should take a courageous and uncompromising stand in favour of equality of opportunity for all races and peoples in the educational and cultural field and use all the resources at its disposal to help in levelling up standards in backward countries. So long as India, for instance, continues to have only a 15 per cent literacy and many of the Eastern countries are deprived of the cultural facilities which other nations enjoy, the world organism will remain educationally and culturally diseased. It is the function of this world organization to address itself to the task of helping to eradicate this disease wherever it may be found.

The UNESCO is at present like an empty bottle—the members of the organization have to put into it what wine they like. Its success will, therefore, depend on the degree of intelligent interest and vigilance which the peoples of the world show in its activities and in the formulation of its policies and it is upto them to ensure that it does not become a rather exclusive and superior association, like the League of Nations Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, in which only a small group of people can take an academic interest. Culture, Education, Science may sound rather remote concepts to the common man, particularly in educationally backward countries, but that is not really

the case. They are in fact woven into the very texture of our life, permeating it through and through and the salvation of mankind depends on their becoming the heritage of all rather than the monopoly of a few. In so far as they can be brought to serve the interests not of any specially privileged groups but of the peoples of the world as a whole, which implies that they should be inspired by the spirit of true democracy and be amenable to democratic control, they will become potent instruments for releasing mankind from the manifold bonds which fetter its development today.

II. THE ROLE OF THE UNESCO IN PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND PEACE

1. General

Man is usually described as a rational animal. This presumably means that he has the capacity to organize his individual and collective life on a rational or reasonable basis, and to devote himself to things that will ensure his security and progress and refrain from doing things which may destroy the possibility of both. Yet, a survey of the history of the world makes one wonder whether that description is not unduly flattering and whether man is not still dominated primarily by his brute instincts and passions rather than by reason. I need not take you back along the corridors of history to illustrate the truth of this rather depressing observation. But I should like to invite you to cast a glance at the life of the generation to which you and I belong. During the brief span of the last thirty years, we have been through two of the most terrible wars in human history which have brought in their train an unparalleled measure of destruction and misery. And these wars were separated by a twenty-year period of uneasy "peace"—a peace rent by many smaller wars, by economic depressions and insecurity, by international rivalries and political conflicts, by the unholy game of power politics and, above all, by the ominous rise of an authoritarian movement which threatened to, and almost succeeded in, destroying all the liberal and democratic cultural values which had been built up with infinite care and suffering and after many setbacks over a long period of centuries. If in the twentieth century—which is, in some ways, the most enlightened and progressive century in which knowledge and education have made the

greatest strides—rational man can behave so irrationally, what hope can there be of any better future for the human race? This, however, is one side of the picture. This irrational man, with his disgraceful record of destruction and his inglorious conduct of human affairs, is also inspired by the desire to build a more gracious life and a better world. His restless spirit, as manifested in the great Religions and Philosophies as also in his Utopias from Plato's Republic downwards, has also been striving to achieve this vision and to re-create this world so that it may be rid of its misery and deprivations, its ugliness and its cruelties. He has always been lured by the vision of a new world without war and bloodshed, without the exploitation of man by man and class by class, where thought will be free and unfettered and the mind without fear, where art and literature and culture and science will not be the monopoly of a few but the heritage of all, where men and women will try to study, with sympathy and understanding, the culture of other nations and other races and mutual confidence and trust will replace suspicion and conflict, where a few power-mad politicians and technicians will not be in a position to imperil the future of the entire human race with diabolical inventions and devices like the atom bomb! Over and over again, men of goodwill and vision have tried to approximate towards this ideal and every time they have been defeated by the forces of unreason and greed which proved stronger than those of idealism and reason.

In November 1945, another such attempt was inaugurated by a group of educationists, scientists, artists, thinkers and men of culture, belonging to 44 different nations, who were interested in the creation of conditions which would make the emergence of a new and better world order possible. They were interested in the problem of inter-

national understanding and peace, not only as any intelligent citizen of goodwill might be but also because they felt that no creative work of any kind is possible in a world without peace and without security. They were people devoted in their daily work to "the things of the mind"—art and literature and science and culture in all its manifestations—and conscious of the fact that all these are the precious fruit of the co-operative effort of the human mind in all ages and countries. If a war can burst into flames any day and reduce books and pictures and laboratories, nay, civilization itself, to ashes; if an atom bomb can blow the whole world—with its politicians and philosophers alike—into smithereens, where is the sense in creative work or the guarantee of its preservation? So, once more, the undefeated spirit of man reared its head and undeterred by earlier failures the members of this Conference devoted themselves to forging a new instrument of peace and international understanding, namely, the UNESCO. Let me quote a few extracts from its admirably drafted Preamble stating the ideas underlying this Organization:

"Since Wars begin in the minds of men it is in the minds of men that the defences of Peace must be constructed; ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war; the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of man and by the propagation in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races; the wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the

dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern;

a Peace, based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of Governments, would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and it must, therefore, be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind."

There are two remarks in this Preamble which will repay closer consideration. First, "Since Wars begin in the minds of men it is in the minds of men that the defences of Peace must be constructed." This is a frank recognition of the fact that war is not just a military or even a political and economic affair. It may be conditioned by an unjust or irrational socio-economic set-up but it is essentially a psychological problem, possibly a pathological problem, and must also be tackled from the educational end. I am reminded in this connexion of a verse in the Quran, the Holy Book of the Muslims, which says:

"And verily God will not change the condition of a people unless they alter their mental content."

This "change of mental content" is, really, the great problem of the age, but so far the attempts that have been made to bring it about, particularly with the object of eradicating the causes of war and establishing international understanding, have invariably failed. And they failed precisely because they were merely attempts made on the political, or at best, the economic plane by politicians who, by their very profession, are versed only in the game of power politics, of large-scale intrigues and of manoeuvring for party and national advantage. In order to conduct an international organization successfully, you require men who can think and feel internationally, not men who are hide-

bound by life-long complexes and limitations. A politician who can look at world problems only as an Englishman or a Chinese or a Russian or a South African or an Indian cannot possibly deal with them in the right perspective. The sectional interest will invariably obscure his vision of the larger human interest, and considering his education and environment we cannot expect anything better. As the Preamble puts it, "Peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of Governments" could not possibly win the support of the peoples of the world because it would rest only on the shaky support of political treaties and a precarious balance of power. The essence of the matter is that what is, in reality, an emotional and psychological problem cannot be tackled on the political plane alone and that men whose minds are wrongly orientated cannot work any political understanding rightly. They must learn to believe in the "intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind" as the first article of their human faith.

The immediate *raison d'être* of this Organization was the realization on the part of the statesmen assembled at San Francisco that all life is one and indivisible and that if they were really anxious to avoid war and maintain peace, the cultural and the economic approach must supplement the political approach. So, under the UNO, the parent organization dealing mainly with political problems, was set up the Social and Economic Council, charged with the task of strengthening the social and economic foundations of peace and creating conditions which will ensure an equitable distribution of goods and services. Likewise, they are thinking of setting up a World Food Council, to tackle one of the primary and fundamental needs of the human race. Similarly, they have taken up this idea of establishing an Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization of all the

nations which will concern itself specially with providing the educational and psychological background for the work of the UNO and the various movements aiming at international co-operation and concord. The purpose of this Organization, as specifically described in the Preamble to the Charter, is "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations, through education, science and culture, in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations." This Organization differs from other international organizations in one rather important respect. It is to consist mainly of people who have to do with educational and cultural activities and whose general function is to influence people's emotions and ideas and to reorient their minds. They cannot directly control the course of political happenings but they can touch the deeper springs of human nature and influence the emotional dynamic of man's activities. An assembly of such persons does not obviously possess great political prestige or wealth or military or economic sanctions. But it has powerful cultural agencies at its disposal—books, newspapers, the theatre, the cinema, the radio and the entire technique developed by modern science for what the French call "the diffusion of ideas". Its members are men who have fewer vested interests to safeguard or personal axes to grind than any other representative cross-section of the people of the world—a fact which was rather strikingly illustrated by the speed and reasonableness with which discussions were carried on in the Conference and the constitution of the Organization was drafted. Moreover, they know from personal experience that the salvation of mankind lies in

willing co-operation on a global scale. In their own spheres they have actually worked on that basis, pooling resources, communicating ideas, cross-fertilizing research. As one of India's leading thinkers and philosophers, Radhakrishnan, has put it: "There is nothing national with regard to education. The different countries are provinces of a common Republic of Culture There is no such thing as Proletarian Mathematics or Nazi Chemistry or Jewish Physics. Culture is international and science is cosmopolitan in its essence and reality." So, while the politician's world is marked by dividing frontiers which he finds excessively hard to transcend, the world of the mind and the spirit knows no such frontiers. The thinkers, the artists, the teachers and the scientists know this, even though many of them may be unable in periods of crises to live up to this truth. They are, therefore, better qualified, in my opinion, to tackle this problem of international concord with faith and intelligence.

What part can such an association of intellectual workers play in the maintenance of peace and security and safeguarding the future of the human race? I am inclined to think that in the past we who represent the world of the mind in its many manifold aspects have been far too weak and timid, far too prone to take things lying down from the politicians and the war-mongers. No doubt, in normal times, many writers and thinkers and scientists have advocated the great values of the human spirit with clarity and passion. But whenever some powerful crisis has arisen and national passions have been inflamed, precipitating war, they have often sinned against the light that was in them and made common cause with the forces of darkness. If they were fully organized and conscious of their responsibility as well as strength, and if they could speak unanimously in defence of human values and against the forces of greed, ness selfish

cruelty and ignorance, even the politicians will have to listen to this collective voice of the human conscience. The present world situation calls upon all men of intellect and goodwill to declare unequivocally that they will not bow down before power or vested interests or mass hysteria advocating the path of unreason and injustice, that they will not allow their God-given gifts to be prostituted in the service of war or domination, and that the formidable array of educational and other propaganda agencies at their disposal will be dedicated to the ends of peace and justice. Is there not a reasonable hope, if this comes to pass, that education may, after all, win its difficult race against that awful catastrophe which threatens mankind today? The UNESCO provides such a platform for all nations on a fairly equalitarian basis and it aims at securing not only the co-operation of the Governments but also of the peoples of the world so that it may speak in their names and touch their hearts, for it is they, after all, who matter in the ultimate analysis. If we can make proper use of this platform and after full and frank discussion agree upon the attitude that we should take towards the crucial issues of the age, and if we can all co-operate in the advancement of knowledge and the diffusion of culture, the UNESCO may well prove to be the harbinger of hope in a world dominated by despair. This is not an exaggerated estimate of the influence which men of intellect can exercise in an emergency—the firm stand recently taken by many distinguished scientists on the question of the atom bomb is both a pointer and a happy augury. And to me the chief significance of this Organization lies not in the specific measures which it may take—important though they are from the practical point of view—but in the fact that it can mobilize progressive forces and ideas in the cause of peace

and creative work. In this crazy world of ours the case for such work has often gone by default; the UNESCO must be made the forum for its advocacy.

There are, however, two conditions which are essential for the success of such an organization. It must include all the nations of the world on a footing of equality—not only the allied nations but also the neutrals and the enemy nations. If the world is really one and its interests are indivisible, we cannot afford to allow any group of peoples to be left out. If Russia does not come in, for instance—as it has not done so far—it would be bad for Russia and bad for the world. If Germany and Italy and Japan are left out, it would be worse, for it is they who need even a stiffer dose of liberalism and democracy and peace-mindedness than others, and therefore their association with such an organization is necessary in their own interests as well as in the larger interests of a world hankering after peace and security. The UNESCO will have for the present a two-fold task—an immediate and short-term task in connexion with the cultural rehabilitation of devastated countries and a long-range programme for promoting international understanding and goodwill in all possible ways. So far as the first objective is concerned, I have only two observations to make. In the first place, this cultural rehabilitation is really a practical manifestation of the general spirit of international co-operation and service that we wish to foster. Our conscience and our hearts are moved at the sufferings that a brutal war has inflicted upon so many countries of the world leaving not only the adults but also children in the grip of physical as well as mental deprivations. The nations that are comparatively better off or less hard hit than others are asked to come forward to relieve something of the physical and spiritual agony of their less fortunate

fellow-citizens of the world. They should realize that in putting these people on their feet materially, intellectually and morally they are not merely conferring a boon but fighting what is in effect the battle of enlightened self-preservation. For if there is one thing which needs to be stressed over and over again in this age, it is that you cannot possibly have peace or security or the quiet enjoyment of cultural amenities in a world that is half-slave and half-free, half-fed and half-starved, half-educated and half-ignorant, or in a country where different classes live in different worlds and startling contrasts of social standards persist. Such a world harbours the seeds of its own destruction in its bosom and those who dare to ignore this stark reality may find their complacency recoiling on them like a boomerang. For the world is today an organic whole and an injury to any one part impairs the efficiency of the whole organism and if neglected may endanger its health altogether. Thus we must all swim or sink together and Social Justice is seen to be not only the highest moral imperative but also the pre-requisite for all that is worth while in life—peace, security, contentment or the unmolested pursuit of creative work. It must, by its nature, be universal and all-embracing—not confined to a class or a country or even a continent—or it will break down altogether. And it must be built up by the co-operative effort of all the peoples of the world, inspired by a consciousness of their common responsibility for this great task of reconstruction which it is the business of education to strengthen. “Cultural rehabilitation” will then become the discharge of this responsibility in a particular context. We must, however, remember that in fighting against “cultural devastation” we should not confine ourselves only to the West but should also consider the needs of Eastern countries like China,

which has been so brutally ravaged, and of India which has, in a sense, been almost in a state of cultural devastation for the last 200 years. Any racial distinction in this matter will be suicidal. Those who are charged with this important responsibility should have the imagination to realize that wherever ignorance and illiteracy and lack of teachers or educational equipment stand in the way of the cultural progress of a people, there is scope for service and assistance by all nations of goodwill. Such service rendered without any ulterior motive is the most irresistible way of breaking down international distrust and antagonisms. An ounce of such service is worth tons of theoretical goodwill!

So far as the larger and long-term programme of the UNESCO is concerned, we cannot discuss its details at this stage with any definiteness, because that is yet to be shaped by the collective wisdom of mankind. I have, however, already mentioned what I consider to be its central objective—the mobilizing of all enlightened opinion and forces *against* exploitation, war and national and racial fanaticism and *in favour of* peace, security and a social order which will permit creative work and encourage the full flowering of the human spirit. Of the various concrete measures that the UNESCO might adopt, some are quite obvious and have been discussed in the press and in academic circles: international exchange of teachers and students in order to remove prejudices against foreigners born of ignorance; encouragement and facilitating of travel; organization of international camps, tours and study circles; study of foreign languages and cultures. There are also other possibilities which the UNESCO might explore, i.e. how the theatre, the cinema and the radio can function as weapons in this fight against war and obscurantism; how History text-books can be rewritten so as to

give people a more rational and sympathetic outlook on the course of human evolution and tone down aggressive nationalism. (As a matter of fact, a Commission has been working on this problem under the auspices of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education.) There are projects for establishing an International University and for training an International Civil Service for the UNO and its affiliated organizations which might be able to take a global view of human affairs and problems as easily and naturally as we take a class view or national view of these things. Wide is the field that lies open and unexplored before this Organization. Shall we go ahead confidently and explore all these possibilities and thereby succeed in setting up a genuine fellowship of man or shall we, as before, allow this precious last chance to be frittered away in fruitless discussions and controversies? Upon the "teachers" of the world, in the larger sense of the term, depends the answer to this question.

2. Teachers and the Curriculum

I shall now discuss briefly the part that the Curriculum and the Teacher can play in promoting international understanding.. Education in schools or colleges can be effective only when all its activities are pervaded by the same spirit and ideology. If our methods of work differ from the educational aims that we profess or our discipline and organization are not in harmony with our ideal of character, education will never achieve its purpose. Hence the need for working out an inner harmony that will illumine all the aspects of education. Now, the Curriculum and the Teachers represent two vital formative factors for translating the aims and ideals of education into practice. Through the curriculum the receptive mind of the child gets

his initiation into the wider world of which he is a member, each important subject—History, Geography, Science, Literature—opening, as it were, a new window on the world, through which he may catch a different view of the baffling, if fascinating universe by which he is surrounded. It is certainly the business of the curriculum, as it is presented by the teacher, gradually to build up before the child's mind a true and faithful picture of the world as it is, throwing into proper relief every aspect and feature characterizing it. It must also give a glimpse, through suggestion and inspiration, of the better world that might come to be and in the making of which all men and women of intelligence and goodwill are deeply interested. Now, whatever else this new world might be, we have already seen that it must be a world where peace and international understanding are possible and men's minds and energies are not wasted in fratricidal conflict and friction. Is it possible for our school and college curricula to help in the orientation of the students' minds in this direction?

There are purists who object to teaching being "biased" in any direction. Personally, I am of the opinion that this is neither possible nor desirable. You cannot educate a person without putting on him, consciously or unconsciously, the impress of certain ideas and values. A teacher who attempts the impossible task of remaining neutral—particularly when teaching subjects like Politics and History—is really afraid of taking a definite stand on the major issues which are agitating the mind of the age. Such a teacher can never be a creative and dynamic influence in the shaping of personality. Moreover, in this plea for neutrality, there is a curious anomaly which we are apt to forget. When teachers happen to advocate the *status quo*, e.g. extolling totalitarianism in a dictatorship or free enterprise in a capitalist

State, they are regarded as objective and impartial. But when they have the mental alertness and the critical capacity to question some of the assumptions on which the *status quo* is based, e.g. advocating democracy in a dictatorship or the right of subject nations to freedom and independence in an imperialistic system, they are accused of "indoctrination." In the past, consciously or unconsciously, education has almost always been weighted in favour of nationalism, class snobbery and war. Shall we be justified now in indulging in theoretical hesitations when there is an imperative call to dedicate education to the cause of internationalism and peace and the solidarity of mankind? We must frankly recognize that education is the process of releasing the mind of man from bondage to prejudice and untruth, and if in this process of release it is cut off from some of its traditional but obnoxious moorings, it will be all to the good. And it is both the right and the duty of teachers to instil in their students, through their teaching as well as their personal example, the right ideals and values which favour the emergence of a fruitful and peaceful Social Order out of the present welter of chaos and destruction.

Let me now proceed to elucidate how the curriculum inspired and vitalized by this faith can become a powerful instrument for realizing our purpose. It will depend, of course, on how the teacher handles it. Subject matter for study is by itself often cold and dead and neutral; it is the magic of the teacher's personality and his faith and enthusiasm which quicken it into life. And it is his choice of facts, his emphasis, his grouping and arrangement of material, like an artist creating a picture, that produces certain irresistible impressions on the student's mind. With this consideration in mind, we can discover numerous opportunities in our teaching for underlining the oneness of the

world and the solidarity and interdependence of mankind. Take Literature, for instance, which is the expression in beautiful form and language of some of the most significant experiences of the human spirit, its joys and sorrows, its triumphs and tribulations, its comedy and tragedy, its admirable successes and pitiful failures. At its best, great literature deals not with the superficial aspects of man's nature or with what may be peculiar to this or that particular bit of God's earth, but with the common heritage and achievements of man. Any one who reads with understanding and sympathy any of the great classics like the Holy Scriptures or Shakespeare, or a great masterpiece like *War and Peace*, or the poetry of Iqbal or Tagore, or Romain Rolland's *John Christopher* or Sinclair's *World's End* Series becomes a better man with an enriched heart and mind and gains a clearer insight into the basic nature of humanity. He is thus freed to some extent from the pettiness and narrow-mindedness that characterize the uncultured man. Now, it is possible to make literature a vehicle for the humanization of man and to stress through it not what divides man from man but what unites all men into a worthy fellowship. Art is similarly another channel through which the human spirit expresses itself in the medium of colour and sound and form, in pictures and music and sculpture and pottery. But this language too is universal, not national; it can traverse distance and time and speak to a congenial spirit across the oceans and continents as well as across the centuries. The teacher of art should also concern himself with pointing out the identity of impulses and emotions which find their expression and fulfilment in works of art. Or take an entirely different subject like Science or Geography. They are both concerned with the relationship of man to the world around

him—science, indirectly, in so far as it enables man to understand the laws and control the forces of Nature and geography, directly, through the interpretation of the interplay between man and his physical environment. In the hands of the good teacher, each of these subjects can become a powerful instrument for adapting man, who has lagged behind socially and morally, to the changed environment in which he finds himself today. The conquest of Nature by science, the annihilation of distance, the quick means of transport and the quicker means of communication, have not only achieved the seeming miracle of a world shrunk to the size of a small neighbourhood region, it has also revealed how in this resounding triumph of man's intellect, co-operation and pooling of resources has been the one fruitful sovereign method. Man must, therefore, learn to show in his relationship with his fellows all over the earth the same qualities of helpfulness, tolerance, good faith, justice and neighbourliness which characterize a small local community of decent persons. The application of one set of moral values and code of behaviour to our own people and another to the rest of the world, or even to those outside our class orbit, is disastrous not only for our character but also for the tranquillity of this brave new world in which there are no real strangers or foreigners. Science can demonstrate this at every step and geography can reveal its operation in the everyday working of the business of the world, i.e. trade and industry, the production and distribution of raw materials, economic and social policy, trade routes and communications, etc. Time does not permit an elaboration of this theme but the trend of my argument is clear. In the teaching of every subject we should stress the fact that we want our students to become "world citizens," and where the demands of this citizenship clash with any

national or sectional interests the lesser must yield to the larger loyalty.

There is one subject, however, of which special mention must be made, i.e. History, which has more to do with the formation of the young student's opinions and attitudes than any other curricular subject. It depends largely on the teacher of history whether the student gets a balanced or a distorted view of the story of man and the rise and fall of societies. There is no greater menace to peace than the aggressive nationalism which is taught in schools—the patriotism whose slogan is “My country, right or wrong,” forgetting that there is no loyalty greater than loyalty to Truth and Justice. A few creative thinkers and writers have raised their eloquent voice of protest, even in this predatory age, against such an attitude—Tagore, Iqbal and Gandhi in India, Russell and Shaw and Wells in England, Romain Rolland in France, Upton Sinclair in America, and others. But education, on the whole, continues to be in the hands of ultra-nationalistic “jingoists”. We must break this dangerous monopoly, whose main support is our own inertia and traditions, and try to place the teaching of history on a more rational and humane basis. In the reconstructed history curriculum, more emphasis shall be laid on the social and cultural aspects which are intrinsically more important than dynastic squabbles and political chicanery because they serve to illustrate better the fundamental nature of the historic process which reveals how, through common and co-operative effort, man has tried to reach out to a better and fuller life. The student of social and cultural history will realize how in this process Jews and Gentiles, Hindus and Muslims, Theists and Atheists have all contributed to enrich man's common heritage. Again, adequate room must be found in the curriculum for “world history” which

will enable the student to appreciate the nature of modern international relationships and to see how diverse peoples have worked out their destiny in different ways and that no particular political or social order or way of life is so superior that all those who do not conform to it should be consigned to the outer darkness. An intelligent study of history will develop that tolerance and broad-mindedness which is necessary for a proper appraisal of the international situation and for cultivating international concord. We should not, however, remain content merely with the passive presentation of history in this light; we must go further and strive to make children peace-minded as actively as we have, in the past, tried to make them war-minded. Many ideas will suggest themselves to the intelligent teacher in this connexion—dedication of special days for commemorating the great “heroes of peace” whose efforts and sacrifices have made culture and civilized life possible; celebrating the birthdays of great men and women of other lands and other peoples; graphic representation of the horrors of modern warfare so that the younger generation that has not passed through the fire will learn to understand what total war means to soldiers and civilians alike. It should be one of the objectives of history teaching to “debunk” war and to show it up for what it really is—a silly, futile, sadistic and essentially inhuman business.

And what about the Teachers? I have already pointed out that it is only they with their living faith in Peace and Justice that can inspire the younger generation with a vision of a better life, and it is only their presentation of the subject matter that can transform dead facts into living truths. It is the teachers alone who with the lamp of their learning can illuminate for the child the ramifications and urgencies of the world in which he lives. It is their

privilege as it is their duty to make him realize that his country is an integral part of a bigger whole, that all these parts belong together, that there is no special virtue or merit in being born in a particular latitude, that each one must learn to understand and appreciate the national characteristics of other people and, above all, that the real line of demarcation among us lies not along the cleavage of race or creed or colour but between those who believe in decency, kindness, justice and individual and social freedom and those who grab and exploit and tyrannize and deny others the freedom they cherish for themselves. The teacher should not only foster understanding but also quicken sympathy which is really an overflow of his own attitude and personality. It cannot be taught academically; it can only be caught as a spark from the teacher's glowing flame. Obviously, this would only be possible if in the training of teachers greater emphasis is placed on character and temperament, the human and spiritual values than on mere intellect or erudition, and the desire for service to humanity counts as a greater asset than a high university degree. For we must remember that in the ultimate analysis education is nothing but the life-giving contact of mind with mind, spirit with spirit, and if the teacher, whose mind and spirit is to kindle the divine spark in the mind and spirit of the learner, is himself lacking in the fervour of idealism or devotion to a noble cause, then indeed will our education be of no avail. It will be a mere lifeless routine, a vain blowing on the ashes of inert knowledge which can never quicken into living flame.

III. ASSESSING THE PROGRAMME

I offer no apologies for inflicting my speech on you after the many eloquent speeches you have listened to, for I feel that there are still a number of points which require to be stressed if we are not to lose sight of our perspective in dealing with the programme of the UNESCO. I should first like to associate myself with the well-deserved appreciation that has been accorded to the Report submitted to the conference by the Executive Secretary, Dr Julian Huxley. This report strikes me not as a dull and dreary document but as a lively interpretation of the modern world and its many complex problems and it discusses intelligently the role which the UNESCO can play in tackling some of these problems with vision and courage.

There are certain features of the Report to which I would invite your attention and I should also like to make some observations which appear to me to be called for. I confess that when I tried to discover—before this Conference was convened—the nature of the projects which were being drafted by the Secretariat, I had the impression that they were too many and various and seemed to lack a coherent purpose. The report, however, has succeeded in presenting a fairly unified programme in which the various proposals have been properly integrated and it is easy to see the lines on which the mind of the Preparatory Commission has been working. The only criticism I can offer in this connexion is that I can find no clear and definite criterion for judging the urgency and the order of priority of the various proposals that have been placed before us. Are they all to be treated as equally important or is preference to be given to some over the others? I take it that, generally speaking, there are two main objects before the UNESCO—

the establishment of peace and security through utilizing all the resources of education, culture and science and the advancement and diffusion of knowledge amongst all the peoples and countries of the world. Which of these is to have immediate priority? And I mean by that not merely financial priority but priority in time and significance. Here I would suggest that the greatest issue of the modern age is the establishment and maintenance of Peace, not only because it is intrinsically desirable but because it is the prerequisite for all creative work and progress and therefore every item of our programme should be related directly or indirectly to this central purpose. While I would be the last person to belittle the importance of knowledge, on which the continued progress of mankind ultimately depends, I do feel that what the modern world lacks, and lacks signally, is not knowledge or even the application of knowledge but wisdom which may be described as the grace of knowledge, and charity, without which the mere increase of knowledge is not a blessing but a curse. I am reminded of the remark of a famous French writer who said: "All true progress is progress in charity, everything else being secondary to it." This means that we must judge the value of all our inventions and discoveries and indeed all our intellectual achievements by this criterion: Do they or do they not contribute to the deepening of wisdom and the kindling of charity in the human heart? The great and recurrent tragedy of man's life, as stressed by an eminent thinker and poet of modern India, Iqbal, is that this knowledge has not been inspired by the vision of humanity. Says Iqbal: "The modern man, who has succeeded in tracing the stars in their courses, has not been able to illumine the dark night of his life." It is for this reason that in the order of priority I would place the cause of

Peace before that of the advancement of knowledge, even though I am fully aware of the importance of both.

One of the reasons why I have stressed this point at some length is that we have got to "sell" the UNESCO to the common man (and woman) all over the world. And I can assure you from what I have seen of people in different countries that they are not frightfully interested in the foundation of new Observatories or Institutes of Mathematics but they are deeply interested in guarding themselves and their children against the horrors of another and infinitely more deadly war in the near future. And this is even more poignantly the concern of the women than of the men. I believe that their instinct is right, for it indicates not so much a failure to appreciate the significance of knowledge as the desire to place first things first and we can ignore this instinctive urge of the common man only at our peril.

Another feature of the Report which has impressed me favourably is the fact that it takes a global or world-wide view of the problems of mankind and it avoids the pitfall of envisaging the world only in terms of Anglo-Saxon or European nations. That is why there is a reference to the need for the rehabilitation not only of devastated countries but also of backward countries, which may be said to have been suffering cultural devastation for centuries; that is why there is an appreciation of the cultural possibilities of backward and undeveloped peoples and a deploring of the fact that in some of them there is a tendency to develop a shoddy imitation of Western culture. I welcome in particular the reference to the need for the equalization of cultural opportunity and I think it is essential that the UNESCO should dedicate itself to levelling up the standards of the backward peoples so that they might be able to pull their full weight in international gatherings. Sometimes there is

a tendency to show a too squeamish consideration for the sanctity of what are known as the "domestic concerns" of these backward peoples. I would earnestly request you to resist this tendency and to remember that ignorance and poverty and disease and cultural backwardness are not domestic but international concerns, and wherever they exist there is scope for the UNESCO to serve. I am reminded in this connexion of a remark attributed to an old Greek writer that wherever there was a beautiful woman in the world he regarded her as a kinswoman. We may not all pretend to emulate the magnificent audacity of this gallant sentiment but I do strongly feel—and I hope I am voicing the opinion of the Conference as a whole on this issue—that wherever there is misery and deprivation and lack of educational and cultural nourishment in the world, we should feel a sense of kinship with those who suffer and should strive our utmost to relieve their suffering. Some of us have not scrupled in the past to annex and exploit whole countries and continents and to appropriate their economic resources for our own use. Shall we be justified now in indulging in old-maidish scruples when it is a question of rendering cultural service on the ground that it would be unwarranted interference with their "domestic concerns"?

If I have been able to carry you with me so far, you will concede that Peace is our supreme objective and it is therefore our business here to ponder how best we can achieve it. There are many international agencies interested in, and concerned with, this problem and therefore it is necessary that, on the one hand, our efforts should be co-ordinated with theirs and, on the other, there should be a clear definition of our scope and field of activity. As I visualize the problem, I find that it has two equally important aspects—the subjective and the objective. On the

subjective side, we are concerned with winning the good fight for peace in the hearts and minds of men and women, and the Report has made a number of useful suggestions towards this end. It will be necessary for this purpose to re-orientate the entire educational machinery in all its stages. We shall also have to undertake a revision of Text-Books and I assure you—if you have not been actively concerned with teaching in schools—that there is so much racial, political and communal poison in many of the text-books that it corrupts the minds and perverts the emotions of the young at the very start. Not only that, but they often fail to distinguish between the significant and the trivial, between the shoddy and the artistic, with the result that they offend not only against moral and social values but also against good taste. It is high time that the problem of revising them was handled in a sober and dispassionate manner. Then there is also the study of Racial Prejudice which, I understand, is to be undertaken shortly by the International New Education Fellowship, with which we might very well co-operate. And, above all, there is the question of the proper use of the formidable array of the Media of Mass Communication which modern scientific technique has developed—the Press, the Radio, the Cinema, the Theatre and all other agencies for the diffusion of ideas. As I see them working today, they look to me like dark and sinister forces competing for the possession of the soul of man. In any well-organized national or international community they must be envisaged as integral parts of a composite educational pattern in which all the different organs will be co-ordinated and will pull together instead of pulling in different directions and nullifying the results that might have been achieved. I am glad to find that a sub-committee is to investigate this problem in all its bearings.

On the objective side, the problem is one of creating such socio-economic conditions as will eradicate the root causes of war, i.e. the glaring social injustices and economic inequalities from which many nations, and classes within nations are suffering at present. I wonder if you realize how terribly education is handicapped by the fact that the general socio-economic set-up of the world is based on greed and violence and injustice and exploitation. Many of us who are teachers carry on our labour of love, decade after decade inculcating values which we regard as rational and humane. But a sudden, senseless and entirely unnecessary political cataclysm, born of these self-same man-made conditions, shatters all our hopes and our work at a single stroke and we find ourselves merely ploughing the sands. It may very well be argued that the creating of these conditions is not our direct concern or responsibility. I concede the point but we must make it clear where we stand on this crucial problem. Are we for a programme of radical social progress which will ensure the good things of life, material as well as cultural, to all the peoples of the earth or are we for reaction and obscurantism and the *status quo*? Dr Huxley's Report refers pointedly to the need for "combating mental and spiritual poverty." This is not only an arresting phrase but a significant idea and should be regarded as one of our supreme tasks. And may I also suggest that this will involve, at least by implication, the combating of physical poverty and disease and the terrible material deprivation from which millions of people in the world suffer today and which makes it impossible for them to develop a genuine cultural life? May I, therefore, sum up my position by saying that, to the twin ideals of Love and Truth, to which the Leader of my Delegation, Sir Radhakrishnan, has referred, we must add a third—Justice,

gracious daughter of Love and Truth—which should govern the relationships of the individual as well as the community? Justice is, in my opinion, the final touchstone on which the real value of all collective human activity in this century must be ultimately tested.

The task that confronts us is extremely difficult and complicated, and we should not therefore be complacent or over-optimistic—even though the atmosphere of this hall is perhaps conducive to such a frame of mind. It is easy to make fine and eloquent speeches full of resounding phrases and noble sentiments. Difficulties arise only when words have to be translated into deeds and carried not only to the hearths and homes but also to the hearts of men and women all over the world. Controversies too will arise but I would entreat you not to bypass them but bravely to face them. We should not be timidly non-committal or discreetly impartial but boldly enter the lists in defence of the right. Too often in the past have intellectuals danced tamely to the tune of politicians and war-mongers and merchants of death, and failed to raise their voice against all things ugly and inhuman. There have been honourable exceptions, no doubt. Tolstoy of Russia was one; your great compatriot, Mr President—Romain Rolland—was another and Gandhi of my country is a third. They and their kind staked their all for the sake of Truth and Peace and were prepared to lay down their lives for it. But the majority have often been unworthy of their great trust and the scientists who recommended the use of the atom bomb are not the only traitors. It is, therefore, for us in this great assembly to resolve that the stifled voice of the human conscience—which has been hesitant and apologetic far too long—shall find fearless expression through us and that we shall refuse to regard ourselves as the train-bearers and camp-followers of

the materially powerful. Let us have intellectual humility by all means, as our Secretary has suggested, and intellectual integrity as well, as Sir Radhakrishnan has advocated. But, above all, let us have the intellectual courage that would scorn expediency for the sake of truth and risk the wide world itself for the sake of man's immortal soul.

IV. PUTTING ACROSS THE UNESCO IDEAS

I wish to place before you certain general considerations in the light of which alone we can assess the various individual projects that have been put forward. It is not necessary for me to discuss at any length the importance of the agencies of "mass communication" because we are all agreed on it. The impact of the press, the film and the radio on our life is so tremendous that they tend to eclipse all other educative agencies and we cannot possibly ignore them. We are also agreed, I think, that at present these agencies are not being used either fully or properly. We have, therefore, to consider a number of practical issues. For instance, how do these agencies react on education, culture and international understanding? What are the factors, if any, that vitiate their possibilities for good? And what can we do to improve the existing situation?

The Canadian delegate who spoke earlier raised the point that one of the objects of these agencies is to interpret peoples to one another. I entirely agree with him, but I wish to invite your attention to how various countries actually get their impressions about one another through the instrumentality of these agencies. By way of example let me take America and India. How, I ask you, is America known to people in India or China, or, for that matter, even in many European countries? Certainly not through its great leaders or its achievements in the fields of science and industry or in democracy and humanism, but mainly through Hollywood films and music. Now, I am fully aware that America has turned out many excellent films, both from the point of view of technique and social significance. But would I be wrong in saying that a large majority of them are very mediocre artistically and do not

present a significant or true picture of the American scene or of the American way of life? In most of these films convulsive acrobatic motions pass off for dancing, wise-cracks and *risque* jokes do duty for wit and humour, slapstick masquerades as comedy, and the hectic life of the night clubs becomes the very essence of high living! Is this the great American civilization for which her noblest sons and daughters laboured during the last two centuries, and does America really intend that this particular facet should be presented to the world? The American broadcasts do not come over very well in India, which is perhaps all to the good, because if they did, I am sure a good deal of what is put out would strike us as either jejune or trivial or meaningless, and would not, by any means, contribute towards a proper appreciation of American culture.

Let me now take the other instance—that of my own country. How is India known to the people of the Western countries? As her own media of mass communication are not yet fully developed, people in Europe and America generally get their idea of India through what is put out in their own press or films or on their radio. I do not think I shall be far wrong in saying that, generally speaking, in the press and on the air, only unedifying and ugly incidents like communal riots and so on are featured prominently, while matters of the highest cultural value and import are ignored because they are not “news”. Similarly, if you see films made in Hollywood and elsewhere, depicting Indian or Oriental life, you will find that they do not give anything like an accurate or faithful picture of life in general but only a sensational or distorted view of things. Thus India would either be a part of the mysterious East possessing fabulous wealth and splendour or a land of superstition and snake-charmers and Yogis and the vanishing

rope-trick! I am sure you will agree with me that an approach of this kind is not the best way to promote international understanding and goodwill, and I may assure you—if it has not occurred to you already—that nothing can be more annoying and exasperating to an ancient country like India or China than to be thought of as merely “amusing” or “picturesque” by other nations. It must be realized not only by the manufacturers of entertainment and purveyors of information but also by all men and women of other nations that we have our problems and difficulties and triumphs and failures no less than others, and it is only on the basis of recognition of our common human kinship that we can come together at all.

Occasionally, of course, one does come across pleasant surprises on the radio and in other agencies of mass communication. For example, in the 1930's Moscow used to put out certain cultural programmes in English which conveyed very effectively all that was being done in Soviet Russia in the field of education, science, arts and culture in general. A couple of months ago, when I was in Australia, I was agreeably surprised to find that in the weekly *Empire News Review* the only Indian news item referred to the proposal for introducing “educational conscription” in one of the provinces. The Third Programme, which the B.B.C. has inaugurated, is yet another pleasant surprise, because of its accent on quality—all the more so for the average Englishman is chary of being taken for a “high-brow”.

If you ask people why the public is given such indifferent stuff in the way of amusement, the reason usually given is that “the public wants it.” As if common people prefer third-rate music, tawdry films, shoddy plays and the yellow press on account of some innate mental inferiority, so that

producers would have to force on them cultural programmes of high quality in spite of themselves! I submit that it is a libel on the masses to say that they have no heart, no mind, no conscience, no desire to improve, no eye for pictures, no ear for music and no appreciation of art. One could cite in support the examples of really good films and plays like "Louis Pasteur," "Madame Curie," "The Devil and Daniel Webster" and many others which have been popular box-office "hits". I would even go further and say that to the extent that this accusation is true, it is a grave indictment of our education as well as our civilization that we have provided such poor education for the masses of our people that they cannot distinguish between good and bad art, between what is significant and what is trivial. The problem, therefore, is one of providing the right quality of education, in the wider sense, which would improve their taste and their standards of appreciation by saturating the home, the school, and the community environment with the best that culture has to offer and technique can convey. The present position is like a vicious circle. We feed them on stuff which corrupts their taste and then cite this debased taste in defence of our policy!

I would, therefore, invite you to consider the real reason for what the United Kingdom Memorandum aptly calls "the lack of a sense of social responsibility." In raising this question I realize that I am treading on somewhat delicate ground; but I am positively of the opinion that it is due to the almost monopolistic control of these powerful agencies in most countries by vested commercial interests. They do not regard them as integral parts of a coherent educational and cultural pattern capable of, and devoted to, raising the standards of taste and enjoyment and assisting in the humanization of men, but only as a means

of making cheap and easy money. As the ballot-box is to vested political interests, the "box-office" is to these commercial interests the supreme god of their idolatry. They are hardly subject to any form of social control except, perhaps, through the Boards of Censors, of whom it would not be uncharitable to say that they are more concerned about the quantity of clothing worn, or not worn, by the artists than with the cultural or social significance of a film or a play. If producers can make huge profits by exploiting mediocre or inferior stuff with the aid of high-pressure salesmanship or freak publicity—whose ingenuity and exaggeration in itself is one of the great scandals of the modern age and deserves careful study by the UNESCO—why should they waste money on writers or artists or musicians or speakers with a mission or a vision? If simple sex-appeal will suffice, why bother to appeal to reason and intellect or to the higher emotions which are imponderables anyway and can at best pay only deferred dividends?

But all this is precisely our problem and our concern. We must plan and work for a steady and gradual improvement of the tastes and standards of appreciation of the people in order to make possible for them a richer and fuller cultural life. We must also use these powerful agencies for inculcating international goodwill and promoting world-mindedness. I am reminded of the Chinese proverb which says: "If you are planning for one year, plant grain; if you are planning for ten years, plant acorns; if you are planning for a hundred years, plant men." We who are here are concerned ultimately with rearing better men and women, and though on account of the exigencies of the present we may be in a hurry for quick results, in striving for the acceptance of our concrete proposals we must keep in mind our ultimate objective.

I would conclude by repeating that the problem, as I visualize it, has two aspects. It has an educational side which is concerned with the introduction of new and better ideas into programmes with the two-fold object of enriching human life as well as promoting international goodwill. UNESCO can tackle this problem successfully if it can bring intelligence and vision to bear on its task. And I should like to pay my tribute in this connexion to the valuable suggestions which have been placed before us by Mr Priestley on behalf of the British Delegation. The second aspect has to deal with the organizational side and the problem here is to break the vicious hold of commercialism and uncontrolled capitalism on these agencies. We have to ask ourselves how these agencies can be utilized to some extent on a non-commercial basis, or at least a basis which is not predominantly commercial. For I cannot contemplate that in the world we are struggling to create, the man with the money-bags deciding what cultural and mental pabulum shall be offered to the citizens of the world in their everyday entertainment. While granting that we cannot directly interfere in this matter because it concerns independent, sovereign national States, we can certainly study the problem in all its bearings and invite the attention of the Member States to the extremely injurious effect which the present stranglehold of commercial interests is having on the press, the film and the radio, leaving it to the Governments themselves to take appropriate action.

V. APPRAISING THE RESULTS

We are at the end of our labours and the beginning, I hope, of our great task. During the last three weeks, we have all assisted at the birth of a great organization which may become a very significant force in the life of mankind and naturally we are all feeling a little elated. But also, I trust, a little sobered because of the tremendous responsibility that we have individually and collectively assumed. Perhaps you will permit me—a very junior member in this galaxy of elder statesmen, scientists, educationists and other men and women of cultural eminence—to share with you a few ideas and observations that occur to me as I survey this crowded period of our deliberations.

I should like, in the first place, to associate myself wholeheartedly with my colleagues in offering my tribute of gratitude and admiration to our hosts—the Government and the people of France and the citizens of Paris—for the magnificent arrangements they have made not only for our comfort and convenience but also for the impressive Cultural Festival which they have imaginatively conceived and generously organized for our benefit. This Festival with its exhibitions of Art, Science and Education, its ballets and concerts, its theatres and cinemas and its documentary films has been a veritable feast of the spirit and a proof, if proof were needed, that Paris is still the cultural metropolis of Europe. What adds immensely to the value of this gesture is the fact that all this has been done at a time when France, like most other countries in the world, is passing through the acute post-war crisis of difficulties and deprivations. I like to think that this is not merely a characteristic expression of French hospitality but also an earnest of the deep interest of our hosts in the success of the UNESCO.

I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of all my colleagues in making these remarks and that you, Mr. President, whose association with the Conference has conferred on it a great distinction, will accept our thanks on behalf of your people in the spirit in which they are offered.

The second observation that I wish to make was suggested to me by the remarks made a short while ago by our American colleague, Mr MacLeish, who appealed to the Conference to work in a spirit of tolerance and harmony. Our deliberations have been characterized by a spirit of reasonableness, almost of cordiality. It would seem hardly worth while to refer to this fact, because this should be so in the normal course of things when men of education and culture come together for discussing problems of common interest. But I am sure I am revealing no secret when I say that an atmosphere of sweet reasonableness is by no means a common thing at international conferences like this. To give only one instance, our betters and superiors who have been labouring over difficult world problems at what is hopefully called "Lake Success" have not, by any means, been able to set an example which would put hope in the weary heart of mankind. But we here have been more ready to appreciate and accommodate one another's point of view, either because our work and our mental training have been different or because we have not been engaged in the game of power politics. At one stage of our deliberations there was, no doubt, as my fellow delegates are aware, a cloud on the horizon.* A cloud no bigger perhaps than a man's hand, but knowing how much mischief a man's hand may cause, many of us felt rather apprehensive. Thanks,

*There was a rather acute tug-of-war in connexion with the appointment of the Director-General of the UNESCO when Dr Julian Huxley was at last happily chosen.

however, to the tact and the collective wisdom of our trusted and able representatives on the Executive Board, the cloud blew away and by weathering this little storm UNESCO has emerged stronger. In this connexion I should like to make a suggestion, if I may, for your serious consideration. It is no doubt a good thing to be able to make compromises but it is not so good that occasions should frequently arise calling for such compromises; rather should we seek always for the most just and fair and effective solution of our problems. Politics has, at its best, established a tradition for compromise and perhaps, in a field where the clash of interest is so obvious and acute, it may be the part of wisdom to try and arrive at the exact arithmetical mean which would please the largest number of interests or persons or States. But in the field of Culture, which is UNESCO's special field, let us try and establish a new tradition—the tradition of being courageously concerned with the search for what is right and proper and most likely to forward our policy and programme. In the domain of Art, Science, Education and Culture—where the fellowship of the spirit is the cementing bond and vested material interests are not all-powerful—this ambition is not too Utopian, though naturally it can only be realized when we learn to look at all our common problems as trustees for all humanity and not for our own particular national advantage.

In surveying the work of the Conference I have been asking myself the question: How far has this session helped to elucidate and crystallize the rather nebulous general ideas with which we started? I think we can reasonably claim that as a result of the work done by the Secretariat, the Preparatory Commission and our own Conference and Committees we can see ahead of us more clearly and plan more

confidently. I shall not take your time analysing the schemes and projects that we have drawn up—this work has been done in an excellent manner by the drafting committee and the ground has been covered by several speakers during the last two days. I shall confine myself to inviting your attention to the practical and far-reaching importance of two cardinal tenets of our faith as they have emerged from all our discussions. In the first place, we are agreed that our primary objective is Peace, whose edifice we have to build in the hearts of the common mass of peoples in all lands. No project, however important in itself, can take precedence over this project; all projects must be judged by the criterion whether, directly or indirectly, they minister to peace. Perhaps a time may come—I hope and pray it may come soon—when we can devote ourselves single-mindedly to the pursuit of the cultural life in all its rich manifestations. But we cannot afford to ignore the urgencies of the present situation and must first eradicate those factors which make a truly cultured life impossible. Hence the various projects that the Conference has selected for promoting international understanding and goodwill.

The second important article of our faith is the belief that we can have neither peace nor freedom nor culture in a world rent asunder not only by political factors but by inequality of social, cultural and educational opportunities. This inequality makes real commerce of the mind impossible amongst the nations of the world; it also condemns large groups of people—and, in some parts of the earth, all the people—to a life that is poor and barren and limited. We should not tolerate the existence of “dark regions” side by side with “bright regions”—that way lies danger. UNESCO, therefore, has decided to address itself—not in a remote future but here and now—to the task of raising the

standard of education, culture and scientific knowledge in countries which have so far been denied these things and thereby to enrich the life of the common man. We are convinced that wars arise not only from the criminal actions of dictators, the follies of demagogues and the machinations of "money-changers" who defile the Temple of Life, but also because millions of people in many lands lead poor and frustrated lives, without the amplitude of a satisfying leisure or the graces of true culture. They are, therefore, fair game for any man with a glib tongue out to sell his particular nostrum for all their social or economic ills. If we are to avert this danger, we must retrieve the life of the common man from this dismal abyss and enrich it with significance. One way to stop a man or a nation from rushing to destruction in war is to enable him or it to feel that life is worth living and that it is neither the part of wisdom nor even of self-interest to sacrifice it at the behest of every unsuccessful house-painter or street-corner orator or clever charlatan. The emphasis that the Conference has laid on such projects as Fundamental Education, Adult Education, the utilization of scientific resources for the common good, the improvement of the quality of programmes offered by the Radio, the Films, the Theatre and the Press derives its sanction from this desire to endow the life of the masses with cultural significance. That implies, of course, the raising of their economic standards as a necessary prerequisite but I am not concerned for the present with that vital issue.

There is one final word which I should like, with your permission, to address to all the delegates. Now that the Conference is over, you will all be going back to your countries where by virtue of your personal or official eminence you enjoy considerable influence and prestige. It is your duty and your privilege to use this influence to spread

the UNESCO ideas in your particular spheres. And the basic core of these ideas is the realization of the intrinsic unity and interdependence of the whole world. Let this be brought home to your children as well as adults in all manner of ways that will impress their imagination and touch their hearts. Let them understand as well as feel the great truth that the welfare of the world is a common responsibility which we dare not shirk except at our peril. Ages ago was posed the question: "Am I my brother's keeper?" And you must have heard many answers to it. I shall give you one in the words of a young boy who was laboriously climbing up a hill with a still younger child on his back. A passer-by asked him patronizingly, "Young man, don't you find that burden heavy?" The boy stopped dead, turned round and looking at his questioner with astonishment, replied, "Burden? But that is no burden—that is my brother!" When we have developed the wisdom and charity and innate goodness of that young boy, we may be able to see light in the darkness that has encircled us. In the meanwhile, we shall do well to remember the stern warning given by the Quran, the holy book of the Muslims: "And beware of the catastrophe which when it befalls will not be confined only to those who have transgressed (but will sweep all in its train)." Can there be a more emphatic vindication of this eternal truth than the plight in which the world finds itself today—a plight from which the UNESCO, amongst other institutions, must strive to rescue the world? I hope and pray that we have here taken the first steps towards that final consummation.

APPENDICES

I. IMPRESSIONS OF MY AUSTRALIAN TOUR

I have just returned from Australia after attending the International Educational Conference which was held in the capitals of the various States of the Commonwealth during September and October, 1946. The central theme of the Conference was "Education for International Understanding" and the overseas delegates who attended it came from England, France, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Poland, China, America, New Zealand and India. As Australia is, in many ways, an isolated continent—even in these days of rapid communications—and there is not sufficient contact between her and this country, readers might be interested in some of the impressions that I have formed about this continent and its people during my rather brief visit, particularly because Australia, on account of its geographical position, is destined to come into closer contact with India in the coming years.

The first thing that strikes one is the tremendous discrepancy between the area of the continent—which is more than twice that of India—and its very sparse population, which is only about seven millions! This population is mainly concentrated along the fertile coastal regions where the climate is comparatively favourable and water plentiful, while the great heart of the continent lies practically uninhabited because it is a barren, inhospitable desert, where the white Australians cannot live and which they have not, so far, allowed other people of hardier races to occupy. In sharp contrast to the distribution of population in India, more than half the total population of Australia lives in half a dozen big cities, capitals of the various States, which compare not unfavourably with some of the cities of Europe and America so far as the material comforts and amenities

of modern civilization are concerned. These cities with their well-planned houses and streets, their up-to-date means of transport and communication, their shops overflowing with goods of all kinds—at least as compared to this country or Europe—their educational institutions, their libraries and museums and their general air of activity and prosperity make a favourable impression on the visitor from abroad. One cannot help paying a tribute to the pioneering spirit and enterprise of these people who have built up this impressive facade of a modern civilization within the short span of 150 years—a short span to me because the history of my country goes back some thousands of years!

What about the inhabitants of the more remote settlements of the “outback” as the Australians call them? They are naturally cut off from many of the amenities which are concentrated in the bigger cities and some of them are so remote and isolated as to remind one of the Laddakh district of Kashmir. Here people still struggle against Nature in her primitive and largely untamed mood, raising crops, tending cattle, rearing sheep whose wool constitutes the raw material of the largest and most productive industry of the continent. But agriculture is not beset by the great handicap which throttles it in India—fragmentation into tiny, uneconomic holdings. In the “outback,” landholders own large tracts of land where the problem is not that of adequate space but of sufficient labour. On account of the limited population and restrictions against immigration, there is serious shortage of labour which will continue to be one of the insuperable difficulties of this continent, till some great statesman arises who has the vision to realize that the dog-in-the-manger “White Australia” policy is not only morally indefensible but also stupidly anachronistic today. And not only the vision to realize but also the personality

and the determination to translate it into practice. I cannot say that I saw any convincing evidence of a general or early change of heart but it was some satisfaction to meet persons, and occasionally small groups, who do realize the injustice of this policy and are in favour of a change. Thus the New South Wales Branch of the New Education Fellowship carried out a small-scale survey of opinion on this issue amongst its members and of those who replied—a rather small number, it may be stated—a fair majority were in favour of admitting immigrants under reasonable conditions. One of the main reasons which weighs with the comparatively fair-minded protagonists of the White Australia policy is the fear that outside labour will underbid local labour and thus adversely affect the standard of living. The obviously rational as well as just remedy against that possibility is to ensure a decent standard of wages for all labour, local or immigrant, and this should not be difficult now that a basic minimum wage of £ 5 a week (about Rs. 280 a month) has been fixed by the Commonwealth for all workers except casual labourers on the land. I have no doubt that either the national conscience of Australia will awaken to the unjust anomaly of the present situation or international forces will compel her to revise her policy.

While dealing with one of these blind spots of Australian policy, I may as well mention what is an even greater and blacker spot—the treatment of the aborigines. The early white settlers and their descendants till comparatively recent times showed no human consideration or compassion for these unfortunate people whom they treated, and even hunted, like beasts of the jungle. The earlier policy of inhuman brutality and the later policy of apathy and indifference has resulted in reducing their total number to less than sixty thousand. They lead definitely sub-human.

lives, have no material comforts or cultural amenities, no special arrangements on a nation-wide scale to bring them up to the level of normal citizenship. A majority of them live far out in the interior—away from the haunts of the white man—where their condition is primitive but they have at least retained some of their native qualities. Those of them, however, who have drifted to the neighbourhood of villages and towns inhabited by the whites are in an even more deplorable condition and seem to live by begging, provoking either the amusement or the pity of the onlookers. It was, however, a relief to find that an increasing number of people felt thoroughly ashamed of this ugly chapter of Australian history and some have actively associated themselves with their cause, especially a few missionaries like Dr Charles Duguid and an old Australian lady who (I was told) has given over fifty years of devoted and selfless service to the aborigines, living in their midst and sharing their life. Persons like her are the salt of the earth and help to restore one's faith in human nature. I was often asked about the plight of the "untouchables" in India and my reply was that although they are now much better off than the Negroes in the Southern States of the U.S.A. and the aborigines in Australia, all of us were—and will remain—equally guilty in the eyes of the Lord and before the bar of human conscience till all traces of racial intolerance and class superiority are wiped out and men and women are valued not for their wealth or birth or race or pigment but because they are men and women sharing the common heritage of humanity. I also pointed out to my friends in Australia that their problem was a very small and manageable problem because the numbers involved were so few and there was no reason why the Commonwealth Government should not be able to tackle it successfully. Most of

them agreed with me but I do not know whether they—the teachers and intellectuals—could be regarded as a representative cross-section of the Australian people. But this is the moral criterion by which Australian civilization will be judged and I fervently hope that it will not be found wanting in the future as it has been in the past.

I came across instances of the attempts made to break down the social and cultural as well as physical isolation of the outlying regions—building up of “Area Schools,” instituting of “correspondence” schools and extending the scope of broadcasting and of social services generally. Perhaps the most interesting and arresting example of this kind is the establishment of what is known as a “Flying Doctor service” which is a gallant attempt—initiated by one of the Airways Corporations and followed by other State and private agencies—to utilize the resources of modern aviation to get medical aid quickly to the most inaccessible regions where medical facilities are not locally available at all and the transport of patients to medical centres by ordinary means would involve delay which would often prove fatal. The new service has established certain special centres in regions where hospital facilities are available—doctors, nurses, beds, etc.—and each centre is connected by what are known as “pedal” radio stations with the remote centres of population in that region. Once a fortnight or once a month the “flying doctor” visits each centre and provides treatment locally for all patients who gather there and takes away with him any serious cases which require special surgical or medical treatment in hospitals. But if there is any emergency, an urgent message is transmitted free over the “pedal” radio to the medical centre and the doctor hops into the plane—they are small planes with accommodation for two or three persons—and flies straight to the place of

call, often landing on a most primitive kind of makeshift "strip". Thus have the benefits of efficient medical aid been extended to distant regions which were till recently as isolated as if they were hamlets in the Himalayas! The "pedal" radio is also used by farmers—I do not quite know how the mechanism works—for talking to other farmers living miles away and thus the sense of physical isolation is reduced to a certain extent. There is a very remarkable case on record before the "flying doctor service" was instituted of how this radio saved a man's life. A patient in the "outback" needed an immediate abdominal operation and there was no doctor to do it and none could get there in less than ten days. The enterprising local postmaster turned himself into a surgeon, anaesthetized the patient with brandy, used a sterilized knife as his surgical equipment and performed the operation in strict accordance with a qualified doctor's instructions that were being relayed over the radio from the nearest hospital which was perhaps 150 miles away! The man was lucky and recovered but others need not now rely exclusively on luck, for the "flying doctor" is at their service.

Politically, Australia is a democracy with a nascent tendency to broaden political democracy into social democracy. The Federal Government as well as all the State Governments except one are Labour Governments at present and the credit for instituting a fairly progressive social legislation should be given to them. There is not the same glaring anomaly between wealth and poverty intimately juxtaposed as one finds in India or even in Western Europe or America. In the past, and even to this day, Australia has been bound rather securely and complacently to the apron-strings of British diplomacy and there is a somewhat naive looking up to the "mother country" in all matters.

But recently with the advent of the Labour Government and partly due to the energetic and provocative personality of Dr Evatt, it has begun to play a more independent part in the international field and I found a fairly general recognition of the fact that, on account of its geographical position, the interests of Australia are closely linked up with those of India, Malaya, Indonesia, China and the United States of America. As one intelligent politician put it, "It is true that our culture is Western and we are of British descent but we are really a Pacific power and our political future is bound up with the great countries which are our neighbours." My own feeling is that while Australia will retain for a considerable time her strong sentimental attachment to Great Britain, she will welcome closer political, commercial and intellectual contacts with America, India and China and the Indies. In fact, I found—at least amongst the circles in which I moved—a great deal of genuine interest in Indian affairs, and at public meetings as well as in private conversations I was asked innumerable questions of all kinds about India—ranging from intelligent and thoughtful questions to those that were frankly amusing in their ignorance and naivete! For instance, the young daughters of a University professor, still in their teens, asked me searching questions about the Indian political scene such as the difference between the ideology of Mr Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi, the distinctive characteristics of Hindu and Muslim religions, Indian mysticism and the life of children at school. On the other hand, quite well-educated adults wanted to know about the vanishing rope trick or the bed of nails on which Indian Yogis recline for their relaxation! Of the political personalities, curiosity about Pandit Nehru was most marked followed closely by Mahatma Gandhi and Mr Jinnah. Questions were also frequently

asked about the condition of the depressed classes, the likelihood or otherwise of India deciding to retain some form of association with the British Commonwealth of Nations and how far Britain could be held responsible for the present political impasse. There was, however, a general expression of sympathy with Indian political aspirations—I must again remind my readers that I am talking mainly about educational and associated circles in which I moved—a hope that India would soon attain her freedom, a wish that she would not entirely repudiate her association with the British Commonwealth and a keen desire that there should be closer relationship between India and Australia in different fields. Dr Evatt, whom I had the pleasure of meeting before my departure, was particularly keen that not only should there be much greater exchange of students, teachers, professors, scholars and lecturers between the two countries—or shall I call them continents?—but there should also be frequent sports fixtures, especially cricket. He went on to point out that while intellectual contacts are exceedingly useful they are apt to remain confined to certain small and select circles, whereas a Test Match becomes a national event and touches the imagination of the people as a whole. I have no doubt that when India has attained her freedom, she will multiply her contacts in all fields—intellectual, political, sports and others—and the present abnormal situation in which her contacts are mainly limited to Great Britain will be set right.

In conclusion, I should like to pay a personal tribute to the *people* of Australia whom I found extremely hospitable, friendly and sociable. They have the happy knack of making a stranger quickly feel at home. They are not stiff and formal in social intercourse, mix freely, talk to one another and to “foreigners” without waiting for the formality of a

proper "introduction," and in the course of a train journey you might even find them inviting strangers to tea or a meal—a habit which I had hitherto regarded as peculiarly Eastern! They are long-suffering at conferences and will sit through a whole series of lectures with patience and good humour. Imagine to yourself fifteen "international speakers" pouring out their words of wit and wisdom—or otherwise—day after day at different sessions of the Conference and never lacking good audiences! I twitted them more than once about it and their reply was that they were intellectually so isolated that it was a treat to attend such lectures. Men and women whom one did not know at all would even stop one on the way to say how greatly they had appreciated or enjoyed some lecture or radio talk they had heard overnight. I would not say that there is a general or widespread appreciation of the "things of the mind" in Australia—for it is still a very young country and the commercial, pioneering "go-getter" mentality is dominant—but there is certainly considerable "potential" for developing such an appreciation which, after all, is more precious for the future of mankind than all the wool and wheat or gold in the world!

II. IMPRESSIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

I wonder how many (or how few) people in India are aware that during September and October, 1946 an International Educational Conference was held in Australia whose central theme was "Education for International Understanding." In a world haunted by war and obsessed with power politics any movement which strives to strengthen the "defences of peace" in the minds of men deserves our notice and support. But such movements are seldom given proper publicity in the press unless they are associated with celebrities whose names are news. I regard this Conference as significant not because it was an Educational Conference and I happen to be an educational worker or because I happened to participate in it but because it was the first conference of its kind held after the blood-bath of the recent World War and because it was concerned not with the technical problems and methods of education—important as they are in themselves—but with the urgent and vital problem of how a return to peace may be facilitated and better understanding amongst nations brought about through the instrumentality of education interpreted in the broadest sense of the word. My use of the words "how a return to peace may be facilitated" implies that we have not yet secured peace, and this is precisely what I mean. The mere cessation of hostilities in the military sense is not peace; it often means nothing more than the dangerous fact that the fight has been transferred from the military to the political or economic field or that instead of being waged on the battle-field it is going on in the hearts and minds of the people where it is, if anything, even more difficult to stop. A lasting and real peace means mental

and emotional disarmament, which is primarily an educational problem and which can only be brought about if the subjective and objective conditions necessary for it have been secured. This Conference was mainly occupied with an examination and scrutiny of these conditions and an elucidation of the ways and means by which education can promote a genuine peace mentality.

The idea of holding this Conference originated with the International Headquarters of the New Education Fellowship in London which had so far held several such conferences in Europe and America, but none in the East. The Federal Council of the Australian branch of the New Education Fellowship—which is fortunate in having a very alert and competent Secretary in Mr. R. J. Best—welcomed the proposal to hold sessions of the Conference in the capitals of the different States and invited select educationists from Czechoslovakia, France, China, Great Britain, Holland, India, New Zealand, Poland and the U. S. A. Russia was also invited to send delegates but for reasons best known to her did not respond. Thus a team of fifteen international delegates came together to discuss the urgent problem of how to fight, through education, the racial, national and colour prejudices that further wars and to formulate the conditions which must be fulfilled if cultural and creative work is to find its proper place in this frenzied world. They discussed various educational topics which they were specially qualified to do by their experience. But the central theme of their deliberations was this search for the principles underlying international goodwill and fellowship. Perhaps I might do well to introduce to you some of the outstanding delegates and indicate in passing the special subjects dealt with by each. That will give you a fair idea of the personnel and the scope of the Conference.

The British delegation, which was the biggest, contained amongst others Dr Llauwreys, Mr Wood and Dr Macallister Brew. Dr Llauwreys is a Belgian-born Englishman who is Reader in Education at the International Institute of Education, London and the Deputy Chairman of the International New Education Fellowship. He has also been working as an Educational Adviser to the UNESCO. He is a scientist and he surveyed the problems of education from the scientist's point of view, stressing the fact that the world had become technologically a unit and education should be shaped accordingly. Mr Wood is an official of the British Ministry of Education and a very fine man with deep religious and spiritual leanings. Some of you may perhaps recall that he came to India in 1937 as a member of a New Education Fellowship delegation, visited many important educational centres and later produced, in collaboration, the well-known Wood and Abbott Report dealing with problems of Technical Education in India. He has done valuable pioneering work in connexion with what is known as the German Re-education Movement and is one of those select individuals who believe that there is a spark of goodness, dim or bright, in all individuals and who are more concerned with keeping it alive and fanning it into a flame than with pointing out their all-too-apparent pettiness and shortcomings. Dr Macallister Brew—who is a doctor of law as well as of medicine—has been responsible for organizing a very important section of the youth movement in England and Scotland—Girls' Clubs and mixed Clubs which are meant to serve as voluntary centres of social, intellectual and practical training for young people during the critical years of adolescence. She is a very witty and interesting speaker and her thesis was that if you provide a full, rich and free, self-governing community life for the youth, they

will develop into normal individuals interested in peace and constructive work and companionship and not persons seething with inhibitions, frustrations, unresolved complexes and discontent—which is a practical psychologist's correct approach to the problem of peace and war.

France sent Mlle Chaton who was a courageous underground worker in France during the German occupation and gave such a good account of herself in that dangerous pastime that she has recently been awarded the "Legion of Honour"—the highest honour to which any French citizen can aspire. She is the Headmistress of a big school in Paris and brought to the conference table bitter lessons, learnt through personal experience, about the Nazi menace to culture and education.

In Kees Bocke, the Dutch delegate, Holland sent one of her remarkable sons—though he is such a genuine humanist and citizen of the world that one hesitates to relegate him to any particular country. He is a man of high idealism, incorruptible integrity and firm convictions for which he has suffered most of his life. He gave up of his own accord a life of comparative ease and comfort and chose the hard uphill path of service. He is the founder of an International Children's Community in Holland and his message is that there can be no peace in the world and no security unless men are prepared to give up their jealously-guarded exclusive privileges. Privilege, in his sense, includes all that sets men apart from one another; like money, it is the root of all evil but is a more generalized menace than money. Sometimes people are apt to regard him as a "denizen of the clouds" who has not got his feet firmly planted on the earth. But that is not seldom the lot of people who have the inconvenient habit of stressing fundamentals in a forthright manner without tempering the

wind of their arguments to the shorn lambs amongst their audiences!

From the United States of America came alert and debonair Theodore Brameld, Professor of Educational Philosophy in the University of Minnesota and Vice-President of the American branch of the New Education Fellowship. He has made a special study of race relations and has the audacious frankness to admit and condemn unreservedly the treatment meted out by America to the Negroes and other minorities. His educational philosophy condemns as inadequate the philosophy of "perennialism" (which, like the reactionary in politics, harks back to the past), of "essentialism" (which confines itself to the tested heritage of the classical curriculum), of "progressivism" (which is content with the "liberal" doctrine of stimulating people only to *think* effectively), and "eclecticism" (which has chosen the convenient path of finding some good in each philosophy!). He is in favour of what he calls "reconstructionism"—these Americans are really wonderful at inventing impressive names!—which realizes that we are in the midst of a revolutionary period with entirely new socio-political outlines, and believes that education must consciously dedicate itself to the shaping of a world which will provide the good life (of security, decency and peace) for all the peoples inhabiting it. He has a fine awareness of the dynamic temper of this age.

Thus you will see that the only nondescript in this galaxy was the present writer! But since he happens to be the writer, there is an irresistible temptation to share with you his point of view and present the Conference proceedings from his angle. Amongst the subjects on which I was invited to speak in the different sessions were the following:

1. "Education for Peace". I stressed the fact that two things were necessary for the securing and maintenance of peace in the world. First, a psychological revolution in the mental content of children and adults which would enable them to eradicate, so far as possible, the habits of greed, exploitation, intolerance and placing the self first, which our educational as well as social and political institutions tend consciously or unconsciously to encourage. Secondly, a frank recognition of the basic fact that peace cannot be imposed by force or by the domination of one or more "Big Powers" but must grow as a natural result of establishing social justice and equality of opportunity in the international field. So long as exploitation and injustices thrive, so long as imperialism, colonialism, racialism and capitalism deny justice between nations and groups, so long as class conceptions of culture and society prevail, so long as false patriotism—"my country, right or wrong!"—is held up as a high ideal and loyalty to latitude and longitude is considered more important than loyalty to Truth, all talk of peace is either hypocritical or stupid. Education must, therefore, seriously address itself to the task of strengthening respect for the objective as well as subjective "defences of peace" in the minds of children and adults. In its final summing up, the Conference accepted the importance of both these factors.

2. "What part can the UNESCO play in the cause of Peace?" My main contention was that in the past intellectuals had been too often content to dance to the tune of warmongers, big business and merchants of death. With a few honourable exceptions, they had failed to make a firm stand for Peace and Social Justice, and at times of national crises had meekly fallen into line with mob hysteria and sought to provide rational justification for it. This had

happened not only in Nazi Germany—where Science and Philosophy and History, in fact, the whole world of thought, were dragooned and conscripted—but also in all other countries, in varying measure. It is imperative now for all teachers, scientists, thinkers and other creative workers to assert their moral and intellectual independence and the UNESCO should become a world forum for voicing the verdict of the human conscience on the crucial issues of the day. On the practical side, it can help in the reorientation of the curriculum, the method of teaching and the ideology of teachers in such a way that they would intelligently reflect and react to the modern world which has become a closely integrated organism in which the weal and woe of all nations and peoples are closely intertwined. Any injury or injustice inflicted on one member must inevitably react on the rest of the organism. This central fact of human interdependence was stressed by all speakers in different ways and I think it made a deep impression on the audiences.

8. "Education in India." This was rather a difficult topic to deal with, because the story that I had to unfold was not one of great achievements but of failure and frustration. I presented it, however, as part of the great world problem, because such widespread illiteracy and ignorance amongst one-sixth of the human race is not only a matter of concern for India herself but is also a menace to the rest of the world. I described the historical and political causes responsible for the present situation—the early apathy and indifference on the part of the State, paucity of financial resources, lack of vision and courage in the formulation of educational policy, the inadequacy of the type of education provided—but pointed out frankly that nothing could condone either the Government or the people for tolerating

any longer this deplorable state of affairs which is a blot on the centuries-old cultural tradition of India. On the other side of the medal, I pointed out certain valiant attempts to improve the quality of education and make it more national in the best sense of the word—experiments like Tagore's Santiniketan and Dr Zakir Husain's National Muslim University of Delhi, the recent formulation of the scheme of Basic National Education (inspired by Mahatma Gandhi) and the Post-War Educational Development Scheme, all of which aroused considerable interest and inquiry.

4. "Educational Ideology of Islam, as interpreted by Iqbal." Having discussed this subject in a monograph which I wrote a few years ago, I do not think I need recapitulate the argument here. However, it was a great pleasure to find that very considerable interest was aroused not only in Islam and its educational ideology but also in the poetry and philosophy of Iqbal whose name, at least, has now become familiar in educational circles in Australia. They learnt with great interest and surprise how, starting from entirely different cultural and religious premises, Iqbal has reaffirmed, with force and clarity, the basic features of true Humanism—respect for individuality, the primacy of the spirit, freedom, growth through living and working for the community, the value of Science for the conquest of Nature, the importance of Love guiding and controlling the Intellect and the need of bringing about that *rapprochement* between Power and Vision which is essential for the peace and sanity of the modern world.

5. "The Shape of the Culture to Come." I discussed the two-fold dualism which has operated in varying measure in all the cultural movements in human history—between Culture and Economics and between Culture and Ethics. After pointing out how this had resulted in the development

of a class conception of culture which denies to the large majority all access to cultural riches and renders the culture of the minority superficial and anaemic, and how people had accepted this sorry state of affairs as normal and inevitable, although it is neither just nor rational, I discussed the new forces generated by modern science which could either enslave or liberate mankind according to the use made of them. The exclusive academic and artistic national cultures of the past which were nurtured in "ivory towers" are obviously an anachronism in this age of science and democracy and social ferment. The culture of the future must therefore assimilate science and respond intelligently to the needs of the new world that has come into being at the behest of Science. It must be dynamic, rich in content, international in outlook, inspired by faith in man's potentialities and appreciative of the essentially co-operative nature of the human adventure.

Through all these talks, I was trying to present to the conference audiences a synthetic picture of the part which a creative, progressive and reorganized education can play in bringing a new and better Social Order into being, based on the fundamental principles of Democracy, Social Justice, Equality of opportunity, Tolerance and Faith in human nature. It is not without significance that my talks struck a responsive chord and evoked sympathy in the Conference circles. It is certainly a hopeful sign to find in a country still dominated by the pioneering spirit of the builders of a prosperous materialistic civilization, a considerable number of people who showed a genuine interest in and appreciation of the things of the mind and the spirit.

This brings me, by a natural association of ideas, to say something, in conclusion, about the people of Australia with whom I came into contact in these conferences. They

impressed me as a very warm-hearted, friendly and hospitable people—against whom my main grievance was that they made us eat too well and too often, even though they charmingly apologized for it to delegates who had come from famished countries! They showed a genuine interest in these conferences and came in their hundreds, sometimes in their thousands, to attend what struck me as unusually long and interminable sessions! Remember that there were more than a dozen of us lecturing at them—not always in a light and amusing style—and yet they sat through these lectures with great patience and good humour. In fact, it was a somewhat novel experience—and flattering to one's vanity!—to find men and women whom one did not know at all expressing their gratitude or appreciation at what one had been trying to say. I was able to attend only the later three conferences at Hobart (in Tasmania), Adelaide (in South Australia) and Perth (in West Australia)—all three beautiful cities! But I was told that, on the whole, almost the same spontaneity of interest was apparent in the earlier three sessions at Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne. The space given to the proceedings of the Conference in all the better daily papers and the all-too-many invitations to some of the delegates to broadcast from the Radio Stations are also indications of the public interest aroused by the Conference.

It might perhaps be legitimately claimed that the Conference did succeed in stimulating widespread interest in the problem of international understanding through education and did something to break down the Australians' sense of intellectual isolation and give them a truer perspective of their position in the world. To me, personally, it afforded a welcome opportunity to contact many educationists and others in a new country and to get to like

them. And I must confess I sometimes fondly flatter myself that it may possibly have made Australians feel more friendly, appreciative and sympathetic towards my country!

III. THE WORLD WE MEAN TO MAKE

I have deliberately chosen a somewhat provocative title for my talk this evening in order to stimulate discussion. I can imagine many of my listeners asking: Who, in the name of impudence, are "We" and why have they the presumption to think that they can remake this old and obstinate world? Perhaps I would do well to start with explaining who "We" are and why we have the impertinence to think that we can do anything to "make" this world and then I can go on to present to you a brief outline of this world of our dreams.

When I speak of the first person plural this evening, I am thinking of all those people who are engaged in the various activities connected with education and culture and the "things of the mind" generally, who are not preoccupied primarily with the production of material goods, useful or not, but are engaged in the pursuit of art and literature, and science and philosophy, which distinguish man above all other animals. The world, as we know it today, is not predominantly the creation of the "intellectuals"—if I may use that much-maligned term—but of politicians and businessmen, and does it require any great intelligence or insight to perceive what a sorry mess these gentlemen have made of it? Indeed, I have the temerity to suggest that if our kind of people had any say in the affairs of mankind, they would have done much better, if only because they could not possibly have done worse! This world of ours has become so complex and its problems so intricate that the hit-or-miss, rule-of-thumb methods of the past cannot possibly be effective today. The rapidly changing socio-political scene is constantly confronting us with "plural possibilities" and novel situations and problems; and we have got to

make quick mental adjustments, choose between alternative courses of action and competing loyalties. Therefore, we cannot possibly rely with any safety on old traditions and practices, and leaders of action who have not the necessary imagination and intellectual acumen to react to the new situations correctly, are apt to prove poor guides, even ~~though~~ with the best of intentions—and I am not so sure that many of them are afflicted with an excess of good intentions! So it is not only necessary to improve greatly the standards of intellectual education for the masses and give them mental alertness and critical judgement, it is also imperative that men with cultivated minds and an appreciation of the higher values of the creative life should be in a position to speak with authority and confidence on the formulation of national and international policies. In the past there has been an unfortunate tendency on the part of the intellectuals to subordinate their independence of judgement and outlook to political or sectional or racial loyalties and expediencies. Politicians, plutocrats and war-mongers called the tune and our intellectuals too often tamely danced to it! This position must now be reversed and they should act as the mouthpiece of the collective conscience and wisdom of mankind. They should cultivate something of the conscious dignity of the reply given by an Oxford Professor, in 1917, to a high military officer who had asked him somewhat patronizingly: "And tell me, Professor, what have *you* been doing during this war?" The Professor's laconic reply was: "Oh, nothing very much, you know. I was merely occupied with the creation of the culture which you claim you are fighting to preserve." I feel that men of culture are qualified to take a sounder view of modern needs because they are engaged in work which is essentially co-operative, which does not recognize differences of race

or religion or nationality but transcends them. "There is no such thing in the republic of culture as Proletarian Mathematics or Nazi Chemistry or Jewish Physics." So while the politician is apt by his training and experience to look at world problems only as an Englishman or an Indian or a Russian or whatever his national label may be, there is at least a better chance that the intellectual will look upon them in the right perspective which is always the world perspective.

So we mean to "remake" the world because we find that it is neither good nor reasonable nor well organized nor just. In the words of complaint addressed by a great poet of modern India to the Almighty Creator :

"Out of the wealth of my imagination, a hundred worlds take shape, like flowers ;

Why hast Thou ~~alone~~ created this one sorry world, steeped in despair !"

And this search for a better world is nothing new or recent ; it has always inspired the efforts and dreams of the finest minds. You find it manifested in all the great religious and philosophical systems and in all the Utopias, from Plato's Republic downwards. The spirit of man has heard, over and over again, the tinkling of the silver bell and it has gone out questing for the Holy Grail. It has ever laboured to

"Shatter this sorry scheme of things entire
And mould it nearer to the heart's desire."

Perhaps the main landmarks of this world of our dreams have not varied a great deal during the ages, even though the inscriptions have had to be rephrased over and over again. It is a world that has been cleansed of its ugliness and cruelty, its human degradation and misery, its wars and bloodshed, its exploitation of man by man and

class by class. It is a world where the mind will not wear blinkers and thought will be free and unfettered, where art and literature and science and culture will not be the monopoly of the few but the heritage of all, where men and women will study with sympathy and understanding the life and culture of other races and other peoples and mutual confidence and trust will take the place of universal suspicion and distrust. There is but one significant difference between the past and the present. Our predecessors could afford to carry on this search in a leisurely manner and it was largely the concern of a few dreamers and idealists and men of vision. But the urgencies of the contemporary situation make it imperative for us—for all of us and not merely the dreamers!—to plan immediately for a more rational world, for who knows but that a few crazy politicians and scientists may imperil the whole future of mankind by diabolical devices like the atom bomb, before we have awakened to the deadly peril in which we stand!

What then are the conditions for the survival of the human race and the preservation of its civilization and culture? I would say, in the first instance, that our world must be a peaceful world, not because peace by itself can solve all our harassing problems, but because it is an indispensable condition for all that constitutes the "good life"—health, economic security, culture and the pursuit of the creative arts. But we are convinced that peace cannot be established through war or coercion or the unholy domination of one or two Big Powers over all other nations. Genuine and abiding peace is only possible on the basis of political and social justice, i. e. by ensuring for all the peoples of the world political freedom and the chance to work out their collective destiny in their own way, and what is equally if not more important, by organizing a social and

international order in which all classes and all nations may have the opportunity to share the material and cultural riches of life in an equitable manner. No doubt this is easier said than done, but there is no other way out. If there are depressed or discontented classes within a nation or oppressed and backward nations and groups in the world, we shall only be sitting over the top of a seething social volcano which may erupt any moment. So our support will be pledged, without hesitation, to all those radical, progressive and humane movements which aim at destroying unjust privileges and exploitation and placing groups and nations on a footing of equality. We value Democracy and will welcome its intensive and extensive development because it offers a better chance of bringing about proper individual development in a dynamic society and because it ensures social integration and equality of opportunity. We abhor and we will fight against totalitarianism, imperialism and colonialism, because they all deny the principle of human freedom, exalt the State to the position of a deity and are based on the naive, stupid and arrogant assumption that some nations and races are innately superior to others and have therefore the right to exploit them for their selfish ends. We are in favour of an attitude and outlook which will take a global rather than national or parochial view of the international scene and show a proper appreciation of the crucial truth that modern science and technology have made the whole world *one* integral unit and that any injury to one particular organ will recoil on the entire organism.

Again, we are alive to the fact that our world today is dominated by science which has placed its impress on all aspects of our life and any philosophy of life or culture that we may develop must be able to assimilate science, its outlook and its methods. We are anxious to exploit science in

order to increase our control over the forces of nature. But we must stipulate that science is used in the service of man, i.e. for the enrichment of his life, softening its hardships and adding to its amenities. It should not be allowed to become either an instrument of exploitation in the hands of the capitalists, or of destruction in the hands of the militarists. Man has acquired immense power, which he wields irresponsibly like a blind person, but he lacks the vision which would enable him to apprehend intuitively the fact of human kinship and inspire him with an all-embracing love and charity. This divorce between Power and Vision is our great tragedy; for Power without Vision becomes inhuman and destructive and cannot see the ends properly while Vision without Power is incapable of building a progressive social order or an enduring culture. Both must combine for the good of mankind and to achieve this happy consummation we must tap the sources of a new and resurgent faith in humanity.

I can imagine the cynic and the hard-boiled realist asking somewhat indignantly: What are the means at the disposal of these well-meaning but foolish idealists to bring about such an unprecedented revolution? The trouble about these hard-headed and self-complacent practical gentlemen is that they believe only in force—the power of armaments and the power of money—and have no suspicion of the tremendous power of Thought and Faith—Thought that can blast and Faith that can move mountains! We are concerned with bringing about a revolution in the hearts and minds of our fellow-men—particularly the young who have not yet been infected by the cynicism and selfishness of the adults. We shall use in this great crusade the power that resides in ideas, suggestion and propaganda—in the press and on the platform, in books and periodicals, in

the cinema, the theatre and the radio, in the educated family and the enlightened church. These have too often been pressed, in the past, in the service of unholy causes. But we are determined that this shall not happen again. We shall give a new orientation to our schools and colleges and our entire educational organization, so that the children who pass through them will acquire an intelligent and sympathetic insight into the nature of the contemporary scene will be immune to the poison of racial, national and class prejudices and will have a keen sense of justice and a desire to help in the establishment of a rational, moral and humane social order.

IV. GOOD-BYE, AUSTRALIA

I came to Australia from India, three weeks ago, to attend the International Educational Conference which has been holding its sessions in the capitals of the various States during September and October. The central theme of this Conference, as you are no doubt aware, was "Education for International Understanding." As a worker in the field of Education, intensely devoted to the cause of Peace and Social Justice, I am naturally interested very keenly in any attempts that may be made in any part of the world to mobilize all existing and potential forces in favour of peace. So when the invitation came to me to participate in this Conference, I accepted it with pleasure and I have attended several of its sessions in your beautiful capitals. This will, I hope, give you some idea of the kind of person who is talking to you.

May I say, at the outset, that we in India were greatly impressed by the fact that you should be the first people in the world to organize this International Conference on Peace through Education after the blood-bath of the recent war. While eminent statesmen—who are therefore also presumed to be wise—have been wrangling in Paris over the terms of the Peace Treaties and a battle of wits is going on over every punctuation mark, your educationists have had the vision to convene a conference of people whose business it is to lay down secure foundations for a peace mentality. I have not the presumption to claim for them—or for other educationists in the world—any supernatural powers. They have no magic wand the waving of which will resolve in the twinkling of an eye the legacy of hatred, bitterness and deep physical and spiritual wounds which decades of stupid, selfish and inhuman policies have inflicted on mankind.

But I do certainly claim that if they have the will and the vision they can play their part worthily in the crusade for peace, because they will be building "the defences of peace" not on the quicksands of pacts and treaties and balance of power but in the hearts and minds of boys and girls as well as men and women. This has, in fact, been one of the recurring themes of your Conference: if you wish to establish abiding peace, you must bring about a psychological revolution which will strengthen in all of us—and that means all the peoples of the world—the sense of human kinship and solidarity and dissolve national and racial prejudices and exclusiveness. Selfishness in personal and collective life is the one cardinal sin against which education and all other progressive forces have to battle and we teachers must throw all our weight on the side of quickening and enlarging the scope of people's sympathy and understanding. They are qualities which must be made universal; we cannot afford to identify them with certain geographical frontiers!

But that is not all. We can have no peace or understanding in a world which is based on economic and political exploitation, in which equality of opportunity is denied to individuals and groups and nations and in which there is no equitable sharing of the material and cultural goods and services which modern science has placed at our disposal in such ample measure. In other words, the psychological revolution which we have envisaged can be brought about with success only if it is accompanied by a reconstruction of society on the basis of social justice which remains the greatest and the most urgent ideal for this age. Without securing this objective, we can neither have fruitful co-operation and concord in national life, nor peace in the international field, nor the possibility of anything like a World Government which could be competent to outlaw war

and aggression effectively. We had been feeling and saying these things in our own spheres and in our different countries. You afforded us the opportunity to clarify and crystallize these ideas and voice them from a common platform. On behalf of my colleagues and myself, I should like to say "Thank you, Australia!"

So much for the first person singular (and plural). What about you and your contribution to the success of these conferences? May I assure you that all of us were profoundly impressed with the sincere friendliness and unaffected cordiality of Australian audiences. Listening to long speeches day after day is no easy matter, but your audiences showed a degree of interest and patience and good humour which was a very pleasant surprise. It was a novel experience to find men and women—whom one did not know at all—coming up spontaneously and expressing their appreciation of what one had been trying to bring home to them and doing so with a generosity of sentiment which was both touching and welcome. I am not vain enough to attribute this to the quality or the appeal of the speeches that we made. I take it, in the first instance, as an indication of your ready friendliness which is quick to appreciate and unreserved in the expression of that appreciation. In the second place, it is a very welcome sign of the interest which you—or, at any rate, your educational and cultural circles—take in the vital problems of peace, education and international understanding. This is all to the good and it is our business—yours and mine—to try and ensure that this interest extends from thousands to tens of thousands of people till the voice of Peace becomes so imperative and powerful that no war-monger dare ignore it. You have made a good beginning with this Conference and may I say: Go ahead, Australia, and more power to your elbow!

I have been greatly impressed with what you have been able to make of your great continent within a short span of 150 years. You have built up—at least in your great cities—a modern democratic civilization with all its manifold conveniences and amenities. Your well-planned houses and streets and parks and gardens, hewn out of what must have been waste land or jungle, your schools and colleges and universities, your libraries and museums, your shops overflowing with goods and your tables groaning under the weight of delicious foods, and your growing industries and manufactures—all these are pleasant things to see and I cannot help paying my tribute to your pioneering ancestors for having done all this so quickly and so competently. Perhaps the days of physical pioneering are now over, unless you start on the great open spaces and deserts which neither you nor any other people can utilize at present. But the days of social and cultural and spiritual pioneering are never over; they stretch endlessly before all peoples who have the vision to image their destiny. It is of this that I propose to speak to you for a moment.

I know it sounds frightfully presumptuous of me to do so; no one who has been in a country for a few weeks should have the temerity to attempt it. My apology is that I speak not as a foreigner but as a citizen of the world who sees your problems as part of the world problems and realizes that all peoples have to tackle them—my people even more urgently and imperatively than yours. I would, therefore, suggest for your consideration the question: Do you think your culture has achieved perfection? If so, disabuse your mind of the idea. You are at the beginning, not at the end, of your great journey. You have no doubt laid the foundations of a fairly prosperous material civilization. But the realm of the spirit is yet to be conquered in which the best never is

but always to be! In a material civilization, there is always the danger of gaining the whole world but losing your own soul, of catching the disease of "commercialism" which gives people the hallucination that making money and having a "good time" are the great objectives of life. If you ever find that danger lurking on the horizon of your national life, use all the powers of your mind and spirit to ward it off. Do you ever feel that you have done all that could be done to establish a just and equalitarian society? I know you have less of the glaring anomalies of wealth and poverty, culture and ignorance than most countries of Europe and America and Asia. But is that much of a consolation? So long as your material and cultural amenities are concentrated in the towns and the cities and your villages remain culturally and mentally isolated, so long as most of your people receive nothing beyond the rudiments of primary education, so long as your aborigines lead poor, miserable, sub-human lives, so long as an exclusive "White Australia" policy holds the field which will not allow men of other races to defile even your untrodden deserts—so long as these or even one of these things endures, the Promised Land is far, far away! We have no right to enjoy material comforts or cultural riches so long as there are classes and groups which are denied similar privileges, for a privilege is a heavy stone hanging round our neck if it is not shared by our fellow men. Do many of your people feel that way? If not, there is plenty of work for your teachers and others with a social conscience to do. Do your people attach sufficient importance to the "things of the mind," the riches of the spirit—art and literature, science and philosophy and the rapier-like thrusts of the critical intellect which can cut through shams and hypocrisies? I do not know; for from your own thinkers and writers I have heard criticism. If they are

right, you are missing the most valuable part of the great human heritage. Go ahead and take possession of it, for it is more precious than all the wealth in the world.

And so, good-bye, Australia, and the warmest thanks for your cordial hospitality, your friendliness, your wonderful knack of making strangers feel at home. One of your Mayors said to us at a civic reception, "I hope you will all go back to your countries as messengers of goodwill on behalf of Australia." You need have no doubt about it. We will!

V. POSTSCRIPT

*(A tribute to Mahatma Gandhi, world citizen and world teacher)**
These speeches and articles were compiled over a year ago. But how fast, how incredibly fast, has this eventful year moved and how much has happened in these twelve months! It has been, in the words of Dickens, "the best of times and the worst of times, the epoch of belief and the epoch of incredulity, the spring of hope and the winter of despair." During this year we achieved our freedom and hope shone bright like the morning star; during this year many of us lost our reason and sanity, our traditional decency and humanity, and indulged in crimes which plunged all men and women of good will into the abyss of despair. They began to wonder whether even freedom—man's most dearly cherished treasure—was worth the price paid ^{for} it!

In this moral crisis and communal storm, in which faith staggered like a man hit sharply on the head and even the best of persons were swept off their feet, there was one light that shone steady and serene, that burnt brighter and brighter as the gloom deepened: Mahatma Gandhi. It was in his vision and courage and leadership that the disheartened men of good will pinned their hope. And they were right. Battling almost single-handed against all the massed forces of reaction and fanaticism, feeling sometimes like a lone voice crying in the wilderness, slowly and painfully he pulled the storm-tossed bark of the Indian State towards peace and safety. In a powerful story by the American writer, Stephen Vincent Benet, Daniel Webster, the great advocate, wrestles against the devil for the soul of his client, Jabez Stone, and eventually wins his case. During the last few months of his life, Mahatma Gandhi seemed to be doing the same in real life, for his client, his beloved

* These speeches and articles were compiled over a year ago.

motherland India. He had raised once again, in challenging accents, the age-old question: "What will it avail a man if he gain the whole world but lose his own soul?" What will it avail India, he asked, if she gained her political freedom but lost her soul in the bargain, that is, her quest for peace and fellowship, her reverence for life, her tolerance and breadth of outlook? Would not freedom, without these qualities, be a mockery and a sham? So, undeterred by threats and opposition, by misrepresentations and slander, he continued to speak the truth—bitter but health-giving truth—in simple words, compelling in their simplicity, and beckoning the people back to sanity and love. He staked his life fearlessly on this issue and, when the fated time came, he courted martyrdom with the name of God on his lips and the smile of peace on his face. Through this spectacular sacrifice, he broke the vicious circle of reprisals and counter-reprisals, made all communities ponder over their misdeeds and thus saved both India and Pakistan from a grave moral and political disaster. He also demonstrated the great truth that a single man, fired by love and strengthened by faith, can achieve miracles. In the words of his great compatriot, Iqbal:

When the sword of individuality is sharpened on the
whetstone of Love,

The stroke of a single soldier does the work of an army!

What made Gandhiji a great Indian also made him a great citizen of the world and a great force for international understanding and peace. What were his special qualities?—his broad humanism which clasped to his heart all mankind, without any distinction of race or caste or creed or colour, his all-embracing *love* which flowed over to all who came into contact with him and consequently earned him their affection, his deep *compassion* which was stirred

by all distress, misery and injustice which embittered for him the very savour of life. In a long, thirty years' war that he—a small, peace-loving man without the power of money or arms—waged against the mighty British Empire, he harboured no rancour or hatred against the British people, whose many qualities he freely admired, and he cautioned his followers also not to confuse the evil system against which they were fighting with the British nation as such. In fact, he always claimed in all sincerity that he was a friend of the British also, but they doubted his *bona fides* and some sneered at this “hypocritical” claim. How could he be their friend and yet organize this ceaseless political fight against them? Recent events have, however, not only shown that he was right in this claim, but also demonstrated clearly that his fight was against evil and tyranny wherever they may be found, that he was just as capable of fighting against his own people if they swerved from the path of peace and honour. This fight needs far greater moral and intellectual courage than fight against a foreign rule because it is backed by none of the applause and the joy which accompanies the latter. It is a test, as well as proof, of rare greatness and he who can do so becomes identified creatively with that elemental war between Good and Evil which is directed against no party or country or race, but is really a war between the higher and lower self of man, individually and collectively. And it is only when individuals and nations can learn to sit in judgment impartially on their *own* actions, when they are prepared to stand for justice, irrespective of racial and geographical considerations, and to fight against evil and injustice wherever they find them—in themselves or in others—that there can be any hope of the triumph of peace over war, of good will over ill will. Mahatma Gandhi

practised this exacting principle in his life and stressed its validity for all national and international relations.

But this was not all. He also perfected the political weapon of *Satyagraha* (Passive Resistance) and *Ahimsa* (Non-violence) for the good fight that every one has to wage in the world—more so today than in the past. He used it with remarkable success in India as well as South Africa. This meek looking man of peace was a life-long fighter, but a fighter with a difference. He said to his followers and in fact to everybody: "Violence does not pay either politically or morally. You may temporarily achieve your ends by the use of superior force, but force brings no change of heart and the end becomes tainted by the use of unworthy means. So fight—but without hatred in your heart. Fight—but only with the sword of non-violence and the shield of truth. Return good for evil, strive to win over your enemies through suffering and sacrifice. Remember that Love ultimately triumphs over hate and greed and injustice."

This has been his greatest gift to this diseased war-torn age—the insistence that politics and international relations are just as much subject to the moral laws and the human decencies as private conduct, and that they cannot be set aside with impunity. The choice before us today is between total destruction threatened by the Atom Bomb—and all the forces and philosophies for which it stands—and the doctrine of Peace and Love and the supremacy of the moral law preached by Gandhiji and many other men of God in preceding ages. In death as in life, he has challenged the imagination and the conscience of mankind and compelled them to search their hearts. That is why no attempt at the appraisal of the forces working for Peace and human understanding can be complete which fails to take into account the indomitable flame of Love that burnt in the frail body of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi.

**PRESIDENT'S
SECRETARIAT
LIBRARY**

